3

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUN 29 1967
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
BR 65 .I34 C87 1846
Cureton, William, 1808-1864
Vindiciae Ignatianae

VINDICIÆ IGNATIANÆ;

OR

THE GENUINE WRITINGS OF ST. IGNATIUS,

AS EXHIBITED IN THE ANTIENT SYRIAC VERSION,

VINDICATED FROM THE CHARGE OF HERESY.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM CURETON, M.A., F.R.S.

OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM;

LATE SUB-LIBRARIAN OF THE BODLEIAN LIBRARY.

QUANTO BEATISSIMI MARTYRIS IGNATII, QUI CUM CHRISTI APOSTOLIS FAMILIARITER VERSATUS EST, ET ANTIQUITAS ET AUTHORITAS MAJOR; EO ECCLESIÆ MAGIS INTEREST VIDERE, NE QUO PACTO APOCRYPHA ILLI ATTRIBUTA CUM AUTHENTICIS IPSIUS SCRIPTIS COMMISCEANTUR ET CONFUNDANTUR.—*ARCHBISHOP USHER.*

LONDON: RIVINGTONS.

MDCCC XLVI.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

REPLY TO AN ARTICLE IN THE ENGLISH REVIEW,

RESPECTING THE ANTIENT SYRIAC VERSION

OF THE

EPISTLES OF ST. IGNATIUS.

QUÆ PORRO DE HIS EPISTOLIS SCRIPSI, DICTA SUNTO ABSQUE PRÆJUDICIO ULLO HIERARCHIÆ ECCLESIASTICÆ, QUAM EXIMIE SEMPER VENERATUS SUM: CUJUS ANTIQUITAS ITA FIRMA, UT NULLIS INDIGEAT FALSIS AC SPURIIS AD SUI STABILIMENTUM RATIONIBUS.

Casim. Oudin, Dissertatio de Vita et Epistolis S. Ignatii. vol. i. p. 139.

When, in the month of July last, I laid before the public some of the results of my researches respecting the Antient Syriac Version of the Epistles of St. Ignatius, I resolved to abstain altogether from entering into the controversy which I naturally foresaw this discovery was likely to produce, not merely in this country, but also on the Continent and in America. I was fully aware that the progress which truth has to make in such a case must necessarily be slow, while it has gradually to win its way between the opposite opinions of contending parties, each of which is inclined to admit those arguments only as valid which seem to support their own cause, and to reject at once as unsound such as may appear rather to favour that of their opponents. In the course of my inquiries I had been led to observe how far prejudice had usurped the place of argument, and party feeling that of judgment, in the Ignatian controversy of the seventeenth century —how these had blinded the eyes of the most able scholars and critics against the soundest reasoning of their adversaries—how each party advancing arguments, which any unbiassed person could hardly help to recognise as conclusive, failed to produce conviction thereby upon the minds of their opponents—how each side having only part of the truth, asserted that they had the whole truth, and both laid claim to a victory which, under such circumstances, never could be decisive on either side.

Many, I doubted not, would apprehend, from the rejection of certain passages from the common editions of the Epistles

of St. Ignatius which they had been accustomed to cite as of weighty authority, that their cause would lose much of its support; while others would be too ready to run into the opposite extreme of believing that they had gained additional strength to their own views, when they found that some of the authorities, which had been quoted by those of a different way of thinking, had been proved to be without any real foundation.* I felt that if I were to enter into the discussion, I should probably have to contend against the too hasty conclusions of both sides, neither of which, merely upon such grounds, I could admit to be well founded. I knew that controversy, while it often leads to a breach of charity, seldom begets conviction on the minds of those who are engaged in it; and I was anxious to avoid the risk of being thrown into collision with any whom, on other accounts, I might be bound to respect or admire, while for the sake of truth I should be compelled to convict them of misapprehension or want of due information. Moreover, I believed that, with so little time as I now have at my own disposal, I should be rendering a greater service to literature and theology by labouring to bring to light some long-lost valuable documents of Christian Antiquity, which, from the accidental circumstance of having bestowed much attention upon a particular branch of literature almost entirely neglected in this country, I may perhaps be better qualified to do than many others of far greater learning and attainments.

With these impressions on my mind, I resolved to give my book to the world even in an imperfect state, to watch with attention all the arguments it should elicit on either side, with the hope of profiting by them in the future labours upon this subject, which I have announced my intention of undertaking, if I should ever be happy enough to have sufficient leisure, and no other person in the meanwhile should have fulfilled the task in a manner which I might deem to be complete and satisfactory.

---

* When the excellent Archbishop Usher first published his edition of St. Ignatius, it was conceived that he had done an injury to that holy Martyr. "I could not but smile when I was of late required by the London Ministers to answer the objections which you had made to the Epistles of Ignatius." *Letter of Dr. Hammond to Archbp. Usher.*—See Parr's Life of Usher, p. 542.

But this resolution I unexpectedly find myself called upon to rescind, not merely to vindicate myself or my own opinions, but for the sake of simple, open, undisguised truth; because, from the peculiar circumstances to which I have already alluded, I may be almost the only one at this moment who has the opportunity of being able to remove a veil which from one side has been cast over her, partly obscuring and partly distorting her. I allude to certain arguments, founded upon "conjectures" only, relative to Syrian writers and Syrian heretics, which have been advanced by the writer of an Article in the eighth Number of the English Review.

Before entering upon the points at issue between us, I would beg to make my best acknowledgments to the Reviewer, for the "hearty wishes" which he has been good enough to express, for my "success in the future literary and theological undertakings which I have announced in my Preface"; and also for the favourable opinion which he has likewise declared, of my "qualification for the task, by learning, industry, and zeal." But at the same time I must confess, that I would rather have chosen that he should have accused me of ignorance, idleness, and apathy, than have so expressed himself as to give ground for the suspicion of disingenuousness or want of candour on my part, which some of the phraseology that he has employed could hardly fail to generate. I may be mistaken in my conclusions on this point; but some of the expressions which he has applied are such as would never suggest themselves to my own mind, unless under a strong conviction of dishonesty; and even then I should feel unwilling to make use of them in a public discussion.

But to come to the subject before us: I will first state the Reviewer's conclusions, and then proceed to examine, step by step, the arguments by which he has arrived at them.

Upon the whole, then, the state of the case with respect to Mr. Cureton's volume appears to be as follows. He appears (and we do not greatly wonder thereat)

——*Nam solet inventis plaudere quisque suis;*——

to have been fascinated by his own discovery of this Syriac Version, and without waiting to take counsel of his calmer judgment, he propounds it to us "as most nearly representing what St. Ignatius himself wrote." This Syriac version proves to be a miserable epitome made by an Eutychian heretic; and so far from invalidating the claim of the Greek text to be received as the

genuine language of Ignatius, it does, in fact, in our opinion greatly corroborate and confirm it.—Page 348.

The first part of this relates to my private feelings, and could therefore only be the result of "conjecture;" as there are no grounds whatever for the Reviewer to found any argument upon, by which he might arrive at such a conclusion. I think, however, I can shew from my Preface that he might have discovered good reason for drawing a different inference.

Whatever might have been my previous judgment relative to the genuineness of the Greek Text of the Epistles of St. Ignatius, as it is exhibited in the Medicean and Colbert MSS., is a matter of no importance, as any opinion of mine founded simply upon the evidence already open to all, and upon which so many able scholars had already propounded their different decisions, would be totally destitute of weight to the world in general, and not perhaps of much consideration with those who may have had opportunities of estimating it. But I do not hesitate to avow, that although I have often read the seven letters attributed to St. Ignatius in the Greek, as they were first published together by Dr. Smith in the year 1709, I never could persuade myself that *all* which they contained were the genuine thoughts and expressions of that Holy Martyr. Every investigation that I was able to make tended to strengthen this belief; while on the other hand I felt an anxious desire to be convinced of their genuineness, because I believed them to be in every way consistent with orthodox doctrine, and to supply arguments which, if their authority were unquestionably established, would be very forcible to some minds with respect to that system of Church government and discipline, to which I am by duty as well as by feeling so closely attached, to which I every day feel fresh cause for thankfulness that I belong, and which I shall be always ready to maintain and defend to the utmost of my ability.

At the same time I must declare my own conviction, that this system is based upon so sure and solid a foundation as to stand in no need of such arguments for its support; and I confess that I have always felt it to be a subject of regret that the great champions, who have stood up in this cause in our Church, should have left their vantage ground, and the weapons with which they were sure to be triumphant, to descend into a debateable field to

fight with arms which had not been thoroughly tried and purified, which at the first onset might snap, which the enemy might shiver to pieces, and with which it was impossible for them to gain a complete and decisive victory.

My anxiety in seeking for more evidence to come to a decision respecting these Epistles was built upon the hope that, by following the path which the judicious Prelate Usher had pointed out, I might be able to discover some additional grounds for ascertaining the truth; and my desire was, should I be happy enough to do so, that they would satisfy my mind as to those doubts which my preceding researches had tended rather to augment than remove. I trust to the reader's indulgence for thus laying before him so much of the history of my own thoughts on this subject, which otherwise can have no interest for him, or be of the slightest importance, except in so far as it may tend to remove any impression made by the Reviewer, that my "being fascinated by my own discovery" might have led me to take a one-sided view of the argument, and even to make "assertions" and "asseverations" which I could not substantiate.

With respect to my not "waiting to take counsel of my calmer judgment before I propounded this Syriac version as most nearly representing what St. Ignatius himself wrote," I beg to be allowed to refer to my Preface, page ix. There it will be seen that it was no hurried or inconsiderate step which I took; that so early as the year 1839 I had transcribed a part of the work; that in the year after Archdeacon Tattam's first return from Egypt, that is, in 1840, I had also discovered and transcribed the Epistle to St. Polycarp; that in March 1843 I had likewise found, in another MS., the three Epistles, to St. Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans; that my book was not published till July 1845; and thus while the labour of the transcription and translation of the two last-mentioned Epistles would not have been the work of a week, and they might easily have been printed in a month, I delayed the publication for two years and four months, during which time I had taken the pains to collect all the fragments of Ignatius cited by various authors given in the other part of my book, which are evidently quoted from a recension similar to the Greek of the Medicean MS.; which militate, according to the Reviewer's notion, against that which "I propound as most nearly representing what

St. Ignatius wrote;" and which he seems to think I should have done wisely to suppress, in order to give more weight to that which I advocate.

This statement, while it acquits me of the charge of precipitancy, and of not "waiting to take counsel of my calmer judgment" before I ventured to publish, will, I trust, shew at the same time that at least I was candid and ingenuous in delaying so long, in order to collect materials which the Reviewer thinks make against my own cause, before I gave to the public a discovery, which he himself pronounces to be "interesting and important." This may, indeed, be no proof in his estimation of my tact and skill in managing an argument, but surely it shews my honesty; and this, I am persuaded, will, upon every occasion, be found to be the best policy. The real fact of the case is, I had no theory which I wished to maintain, no particular views which I was anxious to corroborate: I sought only for plain, simple truth; and in laying my convictions before the public, I wished to furnish them with the same evidence as I had discovered for myself, and then to leave them to decide according to the dictates of their own judgment.

But to proceed now to the second part of the conclusion.

The Syriac version proves to be a miserable epitome, &c. &c.

I shall now examine step by step the grounds upon which the Reviewer believes that he has arrived at this result; and I must beg the readers' indulgence if the process be a slow one. It might perhaps be sufficient to point out one or two of the most apparent errors into which the Reviewer has fallen, and then leave them to infer the rest: but I think it will be wiser to examine the matter a little further in detail, as this, while it serves the more effectually to shew the misapprehension of the Reviewer, may also at the same time supply many facts relative to the Epistles of St. Ignatius, which will be useful in enabling some of my readers to form a more correct judgment relative to the whole question now before them.

To begin, then, with the very first word of the Article, the title of my book is given "*An* Antient Syriac Version," &c. p. 309. It is usual, I believe, for a Reviewer to exhibit the title of a work under his consideration accurately: and verily the difference here

is so slight that I should not have adverted to it, if the use of the indefinite instead of the definite article did not seem to have reference to an argument of the Reviewer in a later part of his paper, which will appear as we proceed. Even this change of one of the smallest words in our language has its peculiar significancy.

In the first paragraph he proceeds to give some account of the manner in which the valuable collection of Syriac MSS. now in the British Museum was obtained. I will stop to make no other correction here than that of an error as to the number of these volumes: the Reviewer says, "amounting in the whole, we understand, to about 250 volumes:" The real number is 366. In a note on a passage in this paragraph, when mentioning the MSS. of the Monastery of St. Mary Deipara, he writes, "Which appear to have been *partially* known to Assemanni (read Assemani), and are referred to by him in his Bibliotheca Orientalis." A short history may be necessary for some of my readers in this place.

In the year 1706, Gabriel Eva, a Maronite, being returned to Rome from a journey into Egypt, related that he had seen, during a visit to the convents in the Desert of Nitria, libraries of considerable extent, in which he had noticed some MSS. more than nine hundred years old, and among them many works of the Greek Fathers long since translated into Syriac, and also many original works in the Syriac, Arabic, and Ægyptian or Coptic languages [*multos Patrum Græcorum tractatus in Syriacum olim translatos; multos etiam Syriacè, Arabicè aut Ægyptiacè à suis primis auctoribus exaratos*], together with an immense mass of Rituals and Service Books.* This intelligence having reached the ears of the reigning Pope, Clement XI., he became anxious to enrich the stores of the Vatican by adding to them a collection of MSS. of such great antiquity and value. Accordingly, in the beginning of the summer of 1707 he despatched into Egypt Elias Assemani, the cousin of the celebrated J. S. Assemani, for the purpose of endeavouring to obtain this collection. With great difficulty he prevailed upon the monks to sell him about forty volumes [*rix quadraginta Elias a Monachis*

* See Assemani Bibl. Orient. vol. I. Præf. §. vii. and §. xi.

ægrè impetravit soluto pretio]. These, after having been upset on the journey down the Nile, and fished up again from the bottom of the river, he transmitted to Rome. They arrived safely, and were deposited in the Vatican at the end of the same year.

About eight years later (in 1715) the Pope resolved to send a second time into Egypt to endeavour to procure the remainder of these MSS. J. S. Assemani himself was selected for this undertaking. He arrived at the Desert of Nitria in the month of August in the same year. I quote his own words respecting these MSS.:—"Bibliothecam intravimus: ducenti ferè codices dumtaxat reperti. Repertos codices recensui, selectos circiter centum petii: sed nullis precibus præter paucos quosdam, quos tamen ipse selegissem præstantissimos, persoluto pretio, a monachis obtinere licuit." In vol. i. p. 561 of his Bibliotheca Orientalis, he has given a catalogue of these *Codices Nitrienses*. They supplied him chiefly with his materials for that great work. He cites these MSS. constantly through the course of it; not merely those which had been brought to Rome, but others also still remaining in the library of the convent of the Desert, from notes which he had taken during his residence there; by means of which I have been able to identify some of the MSS. now in the British Museum with those which he cites: and after all this, the Reviewer furnishes us with a note, that "This collection *appears* to have been *partially* known to Assemanni."

Now although a learned Divine might, perhaps, have been often led to consult this work of Assemani on several subjects of ecclesiastical history and literature, concerning which he could not elsewhere obtain information; and although a judicious critic, in quoting this authority, as the Reviewer has sometimes done—for what purpose and in what manner it will appear as we proceed—might reasonably have been expected to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the grounds and nature of its contents; I am quite ready to allow that ignorance on this point would have been very excusable, even in a very learned man; but only up to that moment when he volunteered to criticise or to teach respecting it. I have not, however, entered upon this subject gratuitously for the sake of pointing out ignorance, or of making any animadversions which may not appear to belong to the subject now before us;

but simply because I see in this instance, in the very first page of the Reviewer's paper, a degree of hasty carelessness, in which I am willing to find the best excuse that can be pleaded for many other statements that I am about to consider, and which do enter deeply into the question we are now engaged upon.

In this page I have nothing more to call the readers' attention to, than that the Reviewer speaks of some of the Syriac MSS. as of "very great antiquity;" and also designates them as "valuable MS. materials." The reason of my noticing this will be seen as we proceed.

In the next page, 310, I have only to observe that my volume has its correct title—"*The* Antient Syriac Version," &c.

At page 311 the Reviewer terminates a quotation from my Preface with these words:—"That he wrote several letters to "various churches, on his way to Rome to suffer martyrdom for the "Faith, is a fact, than which none is better attested." But this is only the first part of a sentence, which proceeds in the following words:—"But how far those Epistles which have come down to "our times, bearing his name, are to be regarded as his genuine pro-"ductions, has been a subject of the greatest dispute. Indeed, "there are no writings either of Christian or Heathen antiquity "concerning which a greater variety of opinion has prevailed, and "more discussion taken place." A reason also for the omission of this part of the sentence, as well as of those which follow, will be sufficiently apparent as we advance.

In page 312 we find the following passage, concerning which I make no remark, but only submit it for the readers' perusal:—

> In 1623, Nicolas Vedelius, having observed that Eusebius, who composed his Ecclesiastical History not much more than 200 years after the martyrdom of Ignatius, had stated (as we have above said) that Ignatius wrote *seven* Epistles on his way from Antioch to Rome, and had specified the *titles* of those Epistles, and that these assertions were corroborated by St. Jerome, was thence led to infer, that among the *fifteen* attributed to him, the seven alone which bore the titles mentioned by Eusebius were really from the pen of the Martyr. This hypothesis was confirmed by the fact, that none of the three which existed only in Latin were of the number of the seven; and that all the seven were found both in Latin and in Greek.

In the next page the Reviewer gives the following account relative to the researches of Archbishop Usher:—

The erudite and enlightened primate of Ireland, Archbishop Ussher, was the first to perceive that certain passages had been quoted as from St. Ignatius by *English* theologians living in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; and he was thence led to believe that MSS. of his Epistles might be found in *this country*. His conjecture was a happy one: in a short time after he had enounced it, *two* MSS. *were* discovered in England, one in the library of Caius College, Cambridge, another in that of Dr. Richard Montague, Bishop of Norwich. Both these MSS. were in *Latin;* and, upon examination, both were found to exhibit the *seven* Epistles specified by Eusebius, but in a much *shorter* form than in either the Greek or Latin hitherto published. It was also observed that all the passages cited from Ignatius by the earliest Christian writers were found in substance in this newly-discovered abbreviated Latin version of the seven Epistles; and those passages which had appeared to the best critics to be inconsistent with the age of Ignatius were *not* found in it: hence Archbishop Usher was induced to make a second conjecture, namely, that this *abbreviated Latin* recension exhibited the Epistles in the form in which they had come from the hand of the Martyr, and he expressed his hope that a *Greek* MS. would be found, corresponding with this shorter Latin one, and he was prepared to recognise in *that* Greek MS., whenever it should be discovered, the genuine words of Ignatius.

In this passage there are several things to be noticed. First, the Reviewer tells us that "both these MSS. were found to exhibit the *seven* Epistles specified by Eusebius;" that is, to the churches at Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia, Smyrna, and to Polycarp. (I give the order as I read it in Eusebius.) But the Reviewer does not tell us that these MSS. also contained four other Epistles attributed to St. Ignatius, and one addressed to him, without any distinction being made as to their authenticity, in the following order:—*To the Smyrneans, to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, the Magnesians, the Philadelphians, the Trallians, the Epistle of Maria Cassabolita to Ignatius, his letter to her, and to the Churches of Tarsus, and Antioch, to Hero, and to the Romans. Neither does he even hint at the circumstance of the Archbishop's having rejected as spurious one even of these seven; viz. that to Polycarp. I shall have occasion to say more on this subject hereafter. But he writes, that "Archbishop Usher was induced to make a second "conjecture, namely, that this *abbreviated Latin* exhibited the "Epistles in the form in which they had come from the hand of "the Martyr."

* See Usher's Dissertatio, p. cxli.

Now it is impossible for me to deny this statement, for I cannot say what the learned Archbishop might or might not have conjectured. It does not however seem very probable that he should have made such a "conjecture," when he writes in the following terms:—"The manuscript Latin copy of Ignatius in Caius "Colledg Library hath this singular in it, that in the genuine "Epistles (for the other I heed not) those passages are wanting "which are excepted against as insititious and supposititious by our "writers; and that the place touching the Eucharist, cited by "Theodoret out of the Epistle to the Smyrnians, which is wanting "in all other books, is to be found in this. But I intend ere long "to publish Ignatius myself, as considering it to be a matter of "very great consequence to have a writer of his standing to be "*freed (as much as may be) from these interpolations of later* "*times.*"* And again, "But here you are to know, beside the "common edition, wherein the genuine Epistles are foully depraved "by a number of beggarly patches added unto his purple by later "hands: there is an antient Latin Translation to be found in the "Library of Caius Colledg, in Cambridge, which, although it be "*very rude, and corrupt, both in many other, and in this very* "*same place also of the Epistle to the Magnesians,* yet it is free "from these additaments, and *in many respects* to be preferred "before the common Greek copy, as well because it agreeth with "the citations of Eusebius, Athanasius, and Theodoret; and hath "the sentences vouched by them out of Ignatius, and particularly "that of the Eucharist in the Epistle to the Smyrnians, which are "not at all to be found in our Greek; and hath *in a manner* none "of all those places in the true Epistles of Ignatius, against which "exception hath been taken by our Divines; which addeth great "strength to those exceptions of theirs, and sheweth that they were "not made without good cause."† And still further, in the dissertation prefixed to his edition of St. Ignatius he writes: "Ut igitur "totum hoc negotium tandem aliquando finiamus: quod olim de "libro, qui *Prædicatio Petri* inscriptus est, disquirendum *Origenes*

* Letter to Dr. Ward, dated Dublin, Sept. 10, 1639.—See Parr's Life of Archbp. Usher, p. 495.

† Letter ccv., concerning the Sabbath and observation of the Lord's Day.—Parr's Life, p. 504.

" proposuit, *sit necne genuinus liber, an nothus, an mixtus:* idem de " Græcis quæ circumferuntur *Ignatii* Epistolis hodie si quæratur; " omnino respondendum esse concludimus, earum sex *nothas*, toti- " dem alias *mixtas*, nullas omni ex parte sinceras esse habendas et " *genuinas*."* We see, then, that the learned Prelate pronounces *six* of these Epistles to be spurious, *six* (not *seven*) to be partly genuine and partly spurious, and *none* to be *altogether pure and genuine;* so that it would appear that he has no claim to the "conjecture that this abbreviated Latin recension exhibited the Epistles in the form in which they had come from the hand of the martyr;" but that the whole credit of this "conjecture" belongs to the learned Reviewer himself.

With respect to the following passage, that the Archbishop " expressed a hope that a *Greek* MS. would be found corresponding with this shorter Latin one, and he was prepared to recognise in *that* Greek MS., whenever it should be discovered, the genuine words of Ignatius," I observe, that the learned Prelate was well aware of the existence of such a Greek MS., as it is evident from these words in his Dissertation:—" Ut ex ea sola " (he speaks of the Latin version above mentioned) integritati suæ " restitui posse Ignatium, polliceri non ausim: nisi alterius exem- " plaris subsidium accesserit; vel Græci, cujus ex *Bibliotheca Flo-* " *rentina* obtinendi spes mihi nuper est injecta non exigua; vel saltem " *Syriaci*, quod Romæ reperiri adhuc posse non despero."† As to how far the Archbishop "was prepared to recognise in that *Greek* MS. the genuine words of Ignatius" will be best understood from what he has himself said after the edition published from "*that* Greek MS." came into his hands:—" Id tantùm de quo jam conqueramur, " habemus: non reperisse nos Mediceum codicem, qualem eum nobis " Turrianus commendaverat, *emendatissimum*. Quo tamen et cum " vetere nostro Interprete Latino (quem hanc editionem secutum " fuisse constat) et cum vulgatis libris Græcis collato, ita correctio- " nem temperandam censuimus: ut quæ ex illis addendæ videbantur " voculæ, uncis includerentur; manifestiora errata è textu tolle- " rentur quidem, sed scriptâ lectione cum notâ $\gamma\rho$. simul appositâ;

* See Archbp. Usher's Dissertation, p. cxxxviii.

† See Dissertation, p. xxvi.

" meliores vulgatorum codicum lectiones, et de dubiis locis conjec-
" turæ, à Pat. Junio et Is. Vossio suppeditatæ, suis in locis ad mar-
" ginem apponerentur. Quibus respondens Latina etiam versio
" est addita, ex nostri Interpretis antiquâ et H. Vairlenii novâ
" utcunque conflata: quâ, intereà, dum *integrius Græcum nobis*
" *obtingat exemplar, contenti esse poterimus.*"*

The Reviewer now comes to describe the edition of Archbp. Usher.

In the meantime he published, from the edition of Paceus, the Greek text, corrected and abbreviated by the Latin version, in an edition which appeared at Oxford in 1644.—p. 313.

I have not been able to find any mention made by Usher himself of the edition from which he published his own. Hammond says it was from that of Vedelius.† And this seems most probable, because he mentions it last in his "LECTORI," and speaks of it as *omnium locupletissima.* Certainly he did not adopt that of Paceus entirely, for he has made use of the copies which followed the Nydpruck as well as the Augsburg MS. in arranging the text, which is sufficiently apparent from the notes to his own work. Nor is the description given by the Reviewer of the Archbishop's edition as a "Greek text corrected and abbreviated by the Latin version" at all calculated to convey an adequate notion of that volume. The Greek text is given *entire* in one column, and the vulgar Longer Latin version in another. Those passages in the Greek, which have no equivalent in the Shorter Latin version of the two English MSS., are printed in red letters, to distinguish them from the rest, and this Latin version itself is found at the end of the volume with a distinct title page—*Epistolarum* IGNATII *Vetus Latina Versio; ex duobus Manuscriptis, in Anglia repertis, nunc primùm in lucem edita;* and is dated 1642, or two years before the date of the title-page at the head of the volume.

It is to be regretted, that the Reviewer should not have been more accurate in his description of this famous work, as well as in citing the no less celebrated treatise of Bishop Pearson, to which, on both the occasions that he has mentioned it, he has

* See Archb. Usher's Preface to the Appendix Ignat. 4to. London, 1647.

† "I had yet the *Lord Primate's* edition of the Epistles, which is known to contain the Vedelian Text."—*Answer to the Animadversions in the Diss. touching Ignatius' Epistles*, p. 12.

given a title which, although marked with inverted commas, is not quite correct.

The Reviewer next proceeds—

> At this very time, the celebrated Isaac Vossius obtained permission from the Grand Duke of Tuscany, to examine the MSS. in the Medicean Library at Florence, and found among them a *Greek* MS. containing *six* of the *seven* Epistles mentioned by Eusebius; and on comparing this Greek MS. with Ussher's two Latin MSS., he perceived that the one coincided accurately with the other, and he published an edition exhibiting the Epistles as they appear in this Florentine MS. at Amsterdam, in the year 1646.

I am quite willing to allow Vossius all the credit which he well deserves for giving to the world his edition of the Ignatian Epistles: but surely he can scarcely be said to have "found" this MS. The existence of it, as we have just seen above, was known to Archbishop Usher, and it had been described nearly a century before by Turrianus as *vetustissimus et emendatissimus.** Vossius's own words are: "Quod autem pura, germanaque, jam "legere possis scripta hæc Ignatiana, Benevole Lector, Biblio- "thecæ Mediceæ debes; debes Serenissimo Principi Ferdinando II, "Magno Etruriæ Duci; cujus incredibili erga studia amore, "inclytæ ejus Bibliothecæ mihi contigit usura, et per hanc Igna- "tianus ille, quem damus, thesaurus." *Præface.*

Moreover, I think that no simple-minded person would gather from the words of the Reviewer, that this MS. contained more than the "*six* of the *seven* Epistles mentioned by Eusebius:" that is to say, others which the Reviewer rejects as spurious, but which, nevertheless, so far as the authority of this MS. is concerned, stand upon an equal footing with the *six*. I quote Vossius's own account:— "Animus fuerat illas solum dare Ignatii epistolas, quæ in codice Flo- "rentino haberentur. Verum cum ille etiam alias quasdam Ignatio "tribueret, licet ejus non essent; uti Epistolam ad Tarsenses, et ad "Mariam Castabalensem; etiam has adjunxi; præsertim cum "viderem non parum variare ab hactenus vulgatis. Cum vero 'codex ille quem dixi Florentinus ad finem esset mutilus; "nullis potuissem argumentis adsequi, quænam in eo epistolæ "desiderarentur, tam ex genuinis quam spuriis, nisi nuper ad manus

* Turrian. explanat. in Clement. Constitut. Apost. lib. 9. cap. 17. Id. pro Epist. Pontif. lib. 2. cap. 10.—See Preface to the Appendix Ignatiana.

" venisset versio vetus, edita ab Reverendissimo Hiberniæ Primate, " Usserio Armachano. Simulatque enim illam videre contigit, " non dubitavi, quin easdem plane epistolas continuerint, et codex " iste, quo vetus Interpres usus est, et Florentinus."*

In page 314, although there be many things against which I might take exception, yet, inasmuch as they relate chiefly to matters of opinion depending upon points of criticism, I shall pass them by, and proceed to those which concern matters of fact.

The Reviewer continues—

Consequently the Medicean text was supposed to exhibit the words of Ignatius. This opinion was maintained by Ussher, and Vossius, and Hammond, who composed two learned treatises upon the subject, and above all, by Bishop Pearson, who examined the objections brought against the seven Epistles by Salmasius, Blondell, and Daillè, and was generally supposed to have set the question of their genuineness at rest for ever in his celebrated treatise, entitled "Vindiciæ Ignatianæ,"† published at Cambridge in the year 1672.

Unfortunately, the first of these sentences, in which the Reviewer writes, "consequently the Medicean text was supposed to exhibit the *words* of Ignatius," is very indefinite, as, indeed, are most of his expressions when he touches upon this point. For instance, at page 311 he says, "from the pen of Ignatius;" at p. 312, "really from the pen of the martyr;" at p. 315, "seven epistles in the *language* in which Ignatius wrote," referring to the form, in the Greek, as contrasted with the "Latin Version" in the same sentence; and again at p. 248, "the claim of the Greek Text to be received as the genuine *language* of Ignatius" which

---

* See Vossius' Edition of Ignatius, p. 116. For the benefit of some of my readers I transcribe here a description of this MS. from Bandini's Catalogus Codd. Græc. Bibliothecæ Laurentianæ. Vol. 2. 1768.—p. 345.

"Cod. VII. Epistolæ incerti auctoris, seu potius S. Maximi, Athanasii, Basilii Magni, Gregorii Nazianzeni, et Ignatii Epistolæ."—No. xxxi. p. 242. "Τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου ἐπιστολαὶ. S. Ignatii Epistolæ ix. Prima est ad Smyrnæos, ultima ad Tarsenses, cujus finis desideratur; desinit enim in verbis ἀνεπίστατοι γὰρ εἰσι τοῦ κι . . . . . .—Codex Græc. Membr. MS. in 4to. Majori. Sæc. xi.: initio et fine mutilus, in cujus primo folio indiculus manu Lucæ Holstenii conscriptus legitur. Constat foliis scriptis. 252."

† The real title of this work is *Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii. Autore Joanne Pearson, Presbytero.*

relates to the matter. This indefinite manner of writing may seem to leave a loop-hole for the Reviewer to escape through when I come to grapple with him: but I think that we must understand his words here in the same sense as they bear at p. 313, where the expression, "the genuine words of Ignatius," corresponds with "the form in which they had come from the author;" that is, that the writer means, in this place, the genuine Epistles of St. Ignatius in the form and words in which they came from his own hand.

Usher's opinion on this point has been already stated: and in part, also, that of Vossius, who held the Epistles as he published them to be in the main genuine. I will add, however, a few sentences from his notes on these Epistles, to shew that he did not place implicit reliance upon the Medicean MS.: — *Nihil hic differt vetus versio. Et tamen aliquid ulcus latet.* ad Smyr. p. 262. *Itaque non opus est repetere illa verba, quæ hic locum non habent. Delenda proinde, ut irreptitia.* ibid. *Addit hic vetus versio:* Et Daphnum, &c. *similiter quoque Pseudo-Ignatius:* καὶ Δάφνον κ.τ.λ. *quæ verba omnino librarii culpa excidisse puto.* ibid. p. 264. *Locus proculdubio corruptus.* ad Ephes. p. 273. *Ex veteri interprete adparet, hunc locum non esse integrum.* ibid. p. 275. *Depravatus locus.* ad Magnes. p. 275. *Inepte deformavit hæc Pseudo-Ignatius. Unde adparet et jam ejus ævo corruptum fuisse hunc locum.* ibid. p. 277. *Omnino rescribendum est, ut et Pseudo-Ignatius, et vetus interpres, legerunt.* ad Philad. p. 282. *Nihil hic juvat Pseudo-Ignatius. Vetus interpres legit* ἐδόξασα. *Sed ne tunc quidem locus fuerit sanus.* ad Trall. p. 285. *Etiam interpres codicem corruptum secutus, ut puto. Antiochus autem nos hoc loco juvare potest.* ibid. p. 286. *Nisi Pseudo-Ignatius, et vetus interpres, hic juvarent; vix posset ex ingenio iste locus restitui.* ibid. p. 287. *Monstrum lectionis. Speciosius Pseudo-Ignatius rescripsit. Quis credat tam inveterata in his Epistolis esse vulnera, ut tempus, quo illa inflicta sunt, propius Ignatii, quam nostrum accedat sæculum?* ibid. p. 290.

To these I may add several instances in which Vossius prefers the reading of the Longer edition of the Greek; and points out variations from the Latin version of the English MSS., as well as proposes conjectural emendations; but these, perhaps, will be

enough to shew his opinion of the Medicean MS. that it did not exhibit the Epistles of St. Ignatius as they came "really from the pen of the Martyr."

For the sake of some of my readers to whom Hammond's works may not be accessible, I will transcribe here a few sentences of his "*Dissertatio Secunda de Ignatio,*" from which they may be able to gather his opinion also, in regard to the accuracy of the Medicean Text, as well as the correctness of that method of criticism which selected as genuine seven only of the Epistles attributed to St. Ignatius: "Certè si Ignatius unquam Epistolas scripserit " (nec enim post tot sæculorum intervalla, sine quâdam vecordiæ " mixturâ, falsi postulabitur antiquitas omnis, quæ scripsisse " affirmat), si epistolarum ejus a Polycarpo ipso facta Sylloge, " non sit inter impias et impudentes Patrum illusiones ponenda, " si exemplaria antiquissima Medicea, et Anglicana, locorum " quidem intervallis satis dissita, omnem tamen inter se mutuò, " simul et cum iis, quibus majores nostri usi sunt, concordiam " foventia, aliquam apud nos auctoritatem nacta fuerint, si, cùm " nihil ex omni retrò scriptorum thesauro contrà nitatur, Ignatius " tot et talibus vindiciis vindicatus, ab interpolatorum mixturis " satis purgatus credi possit, non est quod ulteriùs litigemus. §. 11. " Istum Isaaci Vossii codicem, assumentis quàm plurimis liberatum, " Epistolis etiam integris non paucis multatum, et ad Polycarpianæ " Sylloges (ab Eusebio agnitæ) septenarium numerum redactum, " nos quidem pronis ulnis amplectimur; et licet alias omnes, " istam præsertim ad Heronem Diaconum (cui bene se velle profi- " tetur Walo) Sanctissimo Martyri abjudicandas esse, neutiquam " contendamus, statuimus tamen has tantummodo septem, ut ex " Mediceo et Anglicano codice prodierunt, à nobis in hac causâ de- " fendendas proponere, ut codicem, si leviuscula quædam demas, " satis purgatum, et cui nihil objici possit, quod non eadem faci- " litate rejiciatur. Et, si sibi constare voluerit vir doctissimus, nec " omnes ceu pro certo suppositiitias, una clade æquare, sed tantùm " ut interpolatas multis locis, ad lapidem Lydium vocare, non " verebor dicere, commodiorem purgandi, aut explorandi Ignatii " rationem, a nemine excogitatam esse, (nec a D. Blondello, aut " Walone excogitari posse) quàm quæ illi jamdudum, duorum

" præcipuorum virorum, Archiepiscopi Armachani et Isaaci Vossii " diligentiâ, et operâ, contigerit."*

Even the learned Pearson himself found several things to object against in the text of these Epistles. This will be apparent from one or two passages which I am about to cite from his own Notes, as they were published by Dr. Smith. *Hæc sententia valde perplexa est, neque satis sani sunt codices,* ad Ephes. p. 34. *Hic locus in codice Florentino interpolatus est,* ibid. 35. *Locus est corruptus,* ibid 38. *Sensu nullo: unde apparet vetustissimum hoc in Græcis codicibus mendum,* ad Trall. p. 52. And further, in several instances, he prefers the reading of the longer interpolated text to that of the Medicean MS. Had Vossius, these two able Prelates, and the no less able Dr. Hammond, been possessed of the additional element of criticism which the recently-discovered Syriac Version supplies, they would doubtless have exhibited the Text of the Epistles of St. Ignatius in a far different form from that in which they have left it, but which, with the means they had at hand, was the best that they were able to furnish.

The Reviewer's statement, " that Bishop Pearson was *generally* supposed to have set the question of the genuineness of the seven Epistles at rest for ever, in his celebrated treatise," does not appear to be borne out by facts. That very able and eminent divine was raised to the see of Chester in reward for his great learning and labours; and perhaps no Prelate of the Church of England ever better deserved the honour, or filled that important office with greater ability. The danger which had threatened the whole bench of Bishops was now no longer felt, and the necessity of defending the cause of Episcopacy was urged by no external pressure. Favour rather than merit, and political and personal connection rather than learning, became the surest way to promotion, and consequently we have but few examples of men eminent either for great learning or much theological ability among the dignitaries of the church as the eighteenth century advanced. On this account, perhaps, the question respecting the genuineness of the Epistles of St. Ignatius, with others of a similar nature, lost much of its

* See Hammond's Works, vol. iv. p. 746.

interest in this country, and it seems, therefore, never to have been revived, except by Whiston for another object. The weight of the eminent name of Bishop Pearson might have been considered as decisive with many persons, who had neither the inclination nor the learning requisite to read his book and examine his arguments. And indeed, under similar circumstances, when the conclusions are favourable to their own opinions, most men perhaps would be more willing to rely upon such an authority than to undergo the labour of investigation for themselves. I may perhaps be forgiven for stating here the fact, that since my attention has been directed particularly to this subject, I have never received an answer in the affirmative from any one person to whom I have directed my inquiry, whether he had read Bishop Pearson's celebrated book.

But the question respecting the Epistles of St. Ignatius is not peculiar to England only, nor has it ever ceased to be discussed on the continent, with various shades of opinion, from the time of the first publication of the Shorter Epistles by Vossius, down to the present day. About two years after its appearance an answer was published to Bp. Pearson's *Vindiciæ* anonymously, by Math. de Larroque, with the following title: *Observationes in Ignatianas Pearsonii Vindicias, et in Annotationes Beveregii in Canones sanctorum Apostolorum.* Rothomagi 1674. I shall not take upon myself to offer any opinion respecting this work; but only observe, that it was considered by many to be quite as complete an answer to Bp. Pearson as his own work was to Saumaise, Blondell, and Daillé. But on both sides this, of course, was a mere matter of opinion.

In the Appendix to this Reply I have given the opinions of about thirty critics and scholars on the subject of the Ignatian Epistles, from the year 1650 to 1843. Many more might have been added; but these of persons of widely-different modes of thinking, Jesuit, Romanist, Anglican, Lutheran, Puritan, Arian,*

* I beg to remind my readers that I am in no way responsible for any of the tenets or opinions of the authorities which I cite, and which I have only adduced as testimonies to a matter of *criticism*. I should not have thought it necessary to make this observation, if I had not of late seen so many instances

will be sufficient for the purpose for which they have been adduced. I beg the reader's careful perusal of them. He will see that they not only disprove the Reviewer's statement, that "Bp. Pearson's celebrated treatise was *generally* supposed to "have set the question of the genuineness of the *seven* Epistles "at rest for ever;" but also that very eminent men, such as Hammond, Schelstrate, Tillemont, Grabe, have questioned the propriety of that criticism which selected only the *seven*. He will further see how several judicious scholars, by the application of critical sagacity alone, propounded a judgment on this point, which the discovery of a MS., written more than a thousand years previously, has fully verified, such as Tentzel, Schroeck, Griesbach, Ziegler, Schmidt, Neander, Baumgarten-Crusius, and how the last of these, in a manner, foretold this discovery. The second edition of Neander's Church History of the first three centuries was published at the very time that this collection of Syriac MSS. was brought into England. I think it hardly possible for any candid mind, upon the comparison of the opinions of these scholars with the result of this discovery, to resist the conviction that the Greek text even of the Shorter Recension has been much interpolated, and that the claims of the Syriac version to be "entitled to our serious attention, as most nearly representing what St. Ignatius himself wrote," are immeasurably greater.

I ought not in this place to omit to mention, that in my Preface, at p. viii., I had called the readers' attention to the discussions which have of late years taken place in Germany respecting the Epistles of St. Ignatius; but the Reviewer has passed this circumstance over in silence, either as not suited to the cause which he has undertaken to advocate, or as altogether unworthy of his notice.

At p. 315 the Reviewer states—

> Thus at length, in the year 1689, seven Epistles, corresponding with those ascribed to Ignatius by Eusebius, were now in the hands of the world.

This is rather a broad conclusion upon such narrow premises.

---

of the same fact being distorted and represented under different shapes, according to the different media of party feeling through which it is viewed, that I believe it to be impossible in these days even for the most orthodox to be too cautious.

The case is, out of eleven Epistles, all equally ascribed to St. Ignatius, seven had been selected as bearing the names of seven spoken of by Eusebius, in *two* of which passages were found that had been cited by him. Upon the very same grounds may seven of the Longer Recension, which the Reviewer rejects as interpolated, be said to *correspond;* they also bear the same names, and two of them likewise contain the same passages cited by the Ecclesiastical Historian; indeed Whiston has undertaken to shew that these agree better with the Longer Recension of the Greek Epistles than with the Shorter.*

The next is a remarkable paragraph, and I therefore transcribe it:—

> Nor is this all: another *Greek* MS. containing a small portion of one of these seven Epistles, that to the Ephesians, has been discovered by Mr. Jacobson, at Paris, in our own age; and it will be seen from the collations given by him, in his recent edition of the Apostolic Fathers, that it coincides, as far as it goes, with the received text.

I suppose this passage can only have been written by the Reviewer for the purpose of giving additional weight to the "received text," which he advocates. I will therefore proceed to examine what is the amount of it. But before I do this, I think it due to Mr. Jacobson to say a word or two relative to this *discovery.* I certainly do not find that he ever speaks of having made any *discovery* in this matter, and it is very far from his character to arrogate to himself any praise which does not justly belong to him. But it proves to be no *discovery* at all "in our own age." The existence of this fragment, such as it is, has been known to the world for more than a century. This will be sufficiently evident to any one who will take the trouble to look at the *Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecæ Regiæ,* vol. ii. printed at Paris in 1740. At page 185 we find No. 950 thus described: — *Codex chartaceus olim Baluzianus. Is codex sæculo decimo quarto exaratus videtur.* It contains, according to the catalogue, forty fragments, perhaps excerpta, and among them No. 26: *Fragmenta ex Epistolis Sancti Ignatii Martyris;* and, to shew the good company which this valuable fragment keeps, I will quote one or two more of the descriptions of its fellows:—14. *Nicephori Callisti fragmen-*

* See Whiston's "Essay upon the Epistles of St. Ignatius," p. 14.

tum de Paulo Samosateno. 15. *Ejusdem fragmentum de miraculo à Sancta Euphemia patrato.* 16. *Ejusdem fragmentum de miraculo à sancta Glyceria patrato.* 17. *Ejusdem fragmentum de miraculo à Beata Virgine patrato.* The fragment which we are speaking of contains only just so much matter as is found in twenty-one lines of Mr. Jacobson's edition, which is printed in very large type, and in sixteen of the edition of Hefele. The Reviewer states that "it coincides, as far as it goes, with the received text." Mr. Jacobson gives the following variations:— Page 289. Note 16. *ὑπὸ* Μαρίας] *ὑπὸ* Μαρίας *τῆς παρθένου Cod. Paris.* Page 291. Note 4. Μαρίας] *Cod. Paris.* Μαρίας *τῆς ἀεὶ παρθένου καὶ Θεοτόκου.* Not inconsiderable variations these in so short a space—less than six lines—but still such as we might have been naturally led to expect from the company in which this fragment is found. Page 293. Note 8. *μαγεῖα cum Cod. MSto habent Vossius, Cotel. Aldrich. Russel.* Μαγία *Usser. Vedel. et sic in Cod. Paris.*

I think the reader will now be able to estimate the "additional evidence which has accrued in favour of the seven Epistles" by the *discovery*, "in our own age," of "another Greek MS." which has been described a hundred years ago, as written on paper in the 14th century; and which, in the space of sixteen lines of ordinary type, contains the two valuable additions above specified and one various reading that agrees with the Longer Interpolated Text. But the Reviewer seems to regard this with especial favour, and it multiplies under his fostering care before he reaches the end of his paper. In the summary of his arguments, at p. 349, where he is bringing up the whole force of his battery to the attack, we find it marshalled among the rest, "we have Greek MS. Fragments of some of these Epistles, also coinciding with the received text."

At page 315, speaking of the three Epistles as they are found in the Syriac, he writes—

> These also correspond, *as far as they go*, with the Epistles bearing the same titles, respectively, in the received Greek text; that is, the materials contained in the Syriac agree, in a certain sense, with those of the Greek; but there is this important difference between the Syriac and the Greek, namely, that the former does not contain *half the quantity of matter which is found in the latter.*

This also is rather a bold statement for the Reviewer to make when my volume is in the hands of the public, and every one who chooses has the means of testing it. I shall proceed to do so now. By the "received text" it is evident that he means that founded upon the Medicean MS. in the Epistles to St. Polycarp and to the Ephesians, and upon the Colbert MS. in the Epistle to the Romans.

In the Epistle to St. Polycarp I have pointed out in the Syriac Text five places where it varies from the Medicean Greek, in all of which its readings are confirmed by the Longer Interpolated Recension, and in one of them by the quotation made by Chrysostom also.* In another place, where it varies, this is confirmed by the Longer Latin Version, and in seven others it has its own independent readings.† Moreover, instead of the greater part of the seventh and eighth chapters of the Greek editions, which the Syriac does not recognise, after the sentence "I salute him who shall be thought worthy to go into Syria," it adds the words, "in my stead, as I charged thee." The Reviewer has alluded to this one addition only, at p. 339, for what purpose will be seen in the sequel.

I have taken especial notice of this, as well as of other additions and variations, and of the arguments which appeared to me to be grounded thereon, in the fifth division of the Preface to my book, to which I must beg to refer, as it would take up too much space to insert it here. This part occupies more than six closely-printed pages of the preface, of which twenty-five only are devoted to the consideration of arguments respecting the claims of the Syriac Version; and, in my estimation, it affects them considerably. But the Reviewer has altogether omitted to take the slightest notice of this, either because he deemed it unworthy of his observation, or, perhaps, because it did not seem to strengthen the views which he has undertaken to advocate.

In the Epistle to the Ephesians, besides many passages of the Greek that the Syriac does not acknowledge, and which I have

---

* See Notes 10, 24, 25, 30, and 33 on this Epistle.

† See Notes 3, 11, 13, 14, 17, 22, 27, 32.

consequently omitted from the text, there are fifteen variations from both the Greek and Latin editions.* There are four places in which it varies from the "received text," but corresponds with the rejected longer interpolated Recension.†

There is a sentence also,‡ in which the Syriac version agrees with the Latin of the English MSS. in supplying an omission in the Greek text, which Bp. Pearson (unquestionable authority with the Reviewer) has pointed out as requisite for the sense. I give the passage in Greek, and also the Reviewer's own translation of it:—*ἐλπίζοντα τῇ προσευχῇ ὑμῶν ἐπιτυχεῖν ἐν Ῥώμῃ θηριομαχῆσαι, ἵνα διὰ τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐπιτυχεῖν δυνηθῶ μαθητὴς εἶναι τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτὸν ἀνενεγκόντος Θεῷ προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν. Ἐπεὶ οὖν κ.τ.λ.*

"I hope to obtain by your prayers, to fight with beasts at Rome, that thus I may be able to be a disciple of *God, who offered Himself an oblation and sacrifice for us.*"—p. 345.

I quote the learned Prelate's words:—"Hæc sententia valde "perplexa est. In Græcis duo vocabula deesse videntur, quæ "tamen in Cod. suo Vet. Int. vidit et transtulit. Forte scriptum "fuit *ἰδεῖν ἐσπουδάζετε* post *θηριομαχῆσαι*. Quod si post *ἐσπουδά-* "*ζετε* statim, *Ἐπεὶ οὖν κ.τ.λ.*, omnia erunt clara et perspicua."§ I beg the reader to remark that the learned Bishop suggests here, that, if something be added and something omitted, all will be clear and intelligible. The Syriac version does add what he suggests, and also omits part of what he suggests, and all is clear and intelligible: "—and I hope through your prayers, that, by means of "this of which I am deemed worthy, I may be empowered with "strength that I may be the disciple of God—ye were diligent "to come and see me." I should also observe here, that at p. 345 the Reviewer attempts to seek for an argument against the authority of the Syriac version, from the fact of its having nothing to correspond with the latter part of this sentence in the Greek: but this also is not found in the Latin version of the English MSS.

---

* See Notes 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 25, 26.

† See Notes 3, 4, 7, 9. ‡ See Note 8.

§ See Dr. Smith's Edition, p. 34. Mr. Jacobson's, p. 262.

In the Epistle to the Romans we find the following variations from the Colbert MS., upon which is founded what the Reviewer terms the "received text." There is one confirmed by the readings of the Longer Interpolated Greek, and of both the Latin versions: * a second, supported by the same Greek, the Latin version of the English MSS., and the other Syriac translation at p. 68: four others which coincide with the same Greek and Latin version: † two supported by the same Greek and the other Latin translation: ‡ one by the same Greek and Bp. Pearson's suggestion: § one by the Latin version of the English MSS., and the quotations given by Eusebius, Jerome, and Ruffinus: || one by the same Latin version and Vossius's conjecture: ¶ one by the same Latin version, and the quotation of Timotheus of Alexandria: ** one by both the Latin versions; and another by the Latin version of the English MSS. only.†† These amount to fourteen variations from the Colbert MS., all of which are supported by other authorities.

Indeed, there can scarcely be imagined any stronger argument in proof of the great antiquity of the Syriac text, than that which is supplied by these several variations and coincidences. They shew that it must have followed a recension which supplied the ground-work of both the longer and shorter recensions of the Greek, and also of the copies made use of by Timotheus, Ruffinus, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Eusebius; for there is no other way to account for them, unless we suppose that the Syriac translator had all these at hand, and made a selection from them in arranging his text; an hypothesis which can scarcely be maintained.

In addition to those which I have already enumerated, there are also eleven independent variations, and two entire chapters in the Epistle to the Romans in the Syriac, which, according to the Greek, do not belong to it, but to the Epistle to the Trallians; together with three short sentences which have nothing at all to correspond with them in the Greek—see p. 83.

---

* See Note 23

† See Notes 8, 9, 10, 25, 35.

‡ See Notes 22, 24.

§ See Note 34.

|| See Note 28.

¶ See Note 5.

** See Note 18.

†† See Note 27.

I have likewise offered some remarks on this subject in the fifth division of my Preface; but of these, as I have stated above, the Reviewer has taken no notice whatever.*

After what I have now brought under their notice, I think most persons will agree with me, that the "Syriac Epistles do *not* correspond with the received Epistles, bearing the same titles "respectively in the received text, as far as they go;" but that there are other important differences than merely those omissions which the Reviewer imagines he has accounted for.

In page 316, I find a passage in which I can express my hearty concurrence with the Reviewer's statement. He says—

> It is true, that we have, as yet, a Syriac version of only *three* Epistles; but whatever consequences may legitimately follow from a comparison of the Syriac with the Greek, in the case of these three, may reasonably be extended to the other *four*.

I have nothing to do with the translation of the long interpolated passage which is given in this and the following page. I cannot therefore pause to inquire into the merits or authorship of it, but leave it for those who may be curious in instituting comparisons.

At page 318, the Reviewer cites two passages from the preface to my work; the one relating to the interpolations in the Greek, which concern the Bishops and other clergy; and the other to those respecting the Godhead of our Lord and Saviour. In both these instances he breaks off just at the point where my argument begins; but, referring to them again at page 319, he writes—

---

* If the Reviewer has omitted all mention of these passages, because he did not deem them worthy of notice, he has taken a widely different view of the subject from that of the writer of a critique upon my book in the *Literarische Zeitung* of Berlin, to whom I am indebted for having furnished his readers with a true, impartial, and unbiassed account. His words on the question spoken of run thus:—"Die merkwürdigste Abweichung von den bisherigen Texten ist aber die, dass am Ende des Briefes zwei Capitel eingeschoben werden, die nach jenen dem Briefe an die Trallianer angehören. Es leuchtet sogleich ein, dass dieser Umstand bei der Beurtheilung der Recension, welche der syrichen Uebersetzung zum Grunde lag, von äusserster Wichtigkeit ist." No. 99. §. 1578.

He thinks it very improbable that the Syriac Translator should have *omitted* any passages in favour of episcopacy, because he has *retained* the following words in the Epistle to Polycarp.

And again—

He asserts also that it is clear that the Syriac translator could not have omitted or altered any passages for the purpose of denying the divinity of our Blessed Lord, or he would not have retained others in which it is fully admitted, and even directly asserted. And he gives conclusive proof of the truth of this latter affirmation, by citing numerous passages to this effect from the Syriac Version.

The arguments which I have advanced are the same in both instances; and if they be conclusive in the one, I cannot understand why they should not be equally so in the other. But this would not at all fall in with the hypothesis of the Reviewer, when, in a subsequent part of his paper, he comes to "prove the Syriac version to be a miserable epitome by an Eutychian heretic."

In this page he also writes—

And, finally, Mr. Cureton arrives at the conclusion, that the received *Greek text* is an *interpolated* one, and that the interpolations were introduced into it about A.D. 360, by some person who was desirous of adding the weight of the name of St. Ignatius to the decision of the Council of Nice against the Arians, and also of asserting the claims of the episcopal order against the novel heterodoxy of Aerius of Pontus, who began about that time, A.D. 360, "first to assert the equality of presbyters with *their* Bishop."*

That I arrive at the conclusion, "that the *Greek text* is an interpolated one," as almost every one who has examined the question critically before me has done, is undoubtedly true. But surely the Reviewer must have read my words over in a very hurried manner, to be able to state that I arrive at another conclusion which I never once thought of; namely, that "*the interpolations*" (by which I suppose he implies all the falsifications made in the text, or at least the greater part of them) were introduced by some person into these Epistles about A.D. 360. I have never hazarded any such conclusion respecting them. If my book be in the reader's hands, he will see that the following passage is in the very first page:—"It is with inexpressible "regret that I find myself compelled to abandon at present the

* My words are, with *the* Bishop.—See Preface, p. xxxiv.

" most interesting task which I had proposed to myself, of consi-
" dering in detail each of the passages not recognised by the
" Syriac translator, *for the purpose of endeavouring to ascertain*
" *when, why, and by whom* they were introduced; and by this
" means to establish a canon applicable to all the Epistles of
" St. Ignatius, which may serve as a guide in separating the
" spurious from the genuine. But this would have retarded the
" publication of this little work." From this it will be seen that I had come to no conclusion on this head, which indeed embraces the most difficult questions respecting these Epistles. I was unwilling to contravene the opinion which Archbishop Usher and Bp. Pearson seem to have held, that there were *six* or *seven genuine* Epistles in the time of Eusebius, although I have hinted my suspicion on this point, at p. xxxii. of the Preface, and at p. 98 in the Notes. Assuming it therefore for granted, that the Syriac of the Epistles to Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans represented a pure and genuine text, and consequently, upon this supposition, the same which they believed Eusebius to have had: the first instance that I found of any interpolated passage having been cited, was in an Epistle attributed to Athanasius, written about A.D. 360, or somewhere about thirty years after Eusebius wrote his Ecclesiastical History. I was led then to inquire whether there were any grounds which might seem to account for the introduction of this, or of any other of the omitted passages during this period. I quote here, for the greater perspicuity, what I have said in the place of my preface alluded to, by which it will be seen that I have only ventured to speak hypothetically on this subject:—" This is just the period to which,
" from internal evidence, we should be led to assign the introduc-
" tion of *many* of those passages, *although there be others that*
" *seem to refer to rather a later time, and which might perhaps*
" *have been added subsequently.* All those which are directed
" against the Arian heresy, and which, as it has been noticed above,
" seem to have reference to the definitions of doctrine by the
" Council of Nice, we should naturally *suppose* to have been
" inserted about this time, when the matter was fresh upon men's
" minds, and when the object, both of supporting the decisions of
" that Council, and of opposing Arianism, by alleging the autho-

" rity of St. Ignatius, *might* have supplied a motive and reason " for their insertion. Besides, the very words themselves, so cited " by Athanasius, seem to bear direct allusion to this. Εἷς ἰατρός " ἐστιν, σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικὸς, γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν σαρκὶ " γενόμενος Θεὸς, ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθίνη, καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ " Θεοῦ, πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής.

" Moreover, this was just the period when Aerius of Pontus, " disappointed in his hopes and expectations of being raised to the " Episcopate, began to propagate his heresy, and first to assert " the equality of Presbyters with the Bishop. And this, among " other reasons, *might* have furnished the interpolator with a " motive for insisting so much upon the necessity of the Episcopal " office, and of its being essential to the constitution of Christ's " Church. Nor does there appear to be any force in the objection " which may perhaps suggest itself here—that, had this passage " been interpolated at so recent a period, it would hardly have been " cited as genuine by Athanasius. It appears far from improbable " that he might never have met with the Epistles of St. Ignatius " previously. And we can hardly avoid concluding that they " must have been unknown in their present form to Epiphanius, " who wrote about the same time, or he would not have failed to " bring forward their authority against various heresies, and more " especially in refuting that of Aerius, above spoken of."—P. xxxiv.

I should not have thought it necessary to take this trouble, to shew that I had not " arrived at the conclusion that *the interpolations* were introduced into the text by *some person* about A.D. 360," if this had not been first stated by the Reviewer, and then used by him as an argument in a subsequent passage. Even had I propounded the most absurd theory possible as to the *time* at which any or all of *the interpolations* had been introduced, and attempted to support it by the most futile and ridiculous arguments, this would not in the slightest degree have affected the question as to their being interpolations, which stands upon different grounds. It would only have shewn my own folly in attempting to meddle with a subject for which I was incompetent, and to argue upon a matter concerning which I was ignorant and unprepared.

At page 321, the Reviewer writes—

We believe that we have now presented to our readers the principal grounds on which Mr. Cureton has formed his opinion that the genuine expressions of St. Ignatius are not to be sought for in the hitherto received Greek text, but in the Syriac version now first published to the world. Lest, however, we should have inadvertently omitted any thing material in his arguments in favour of that version, we will transcribe his own summary of them.

Now all this appears very candid at first sight; but surely it is far otherwise in reality, to transcribe a summary of arguments, which assume the readers' acquaintance with what has preceded, and then to attack them in detail. I think, however, that every one who examines my preface will find many other grounds for strengthening the opinion that I have expressed on this subject, which are not in any way alluded to in this summary, and which the Reviewer seems not only "inadvertently to have omitted," but also most diligently to have kept out of sight, and withheld from "his readers'" consideration. Of this last sort I will only mention the circumstance of his never even alluding to the fact, that the *seven* epistles were always found in MSS. together with others which even the Reviewer rejects as spurious, and that all these were placed upon the same level, and no distinction made there as to their authority. He has never once adverted to the circumstance, that some of these so rejected Epistles have been highly esteemed, and considered equally genuine by several critics who judged not that the mere mention made by Eusebius was sufficient evidence in this case. He has never alluded to the circumstance of Archbishop Usher having rejected as spurious the Epistle to St. Polycarp, or of his desire to obtain the Syriac version, of the existence of which he was aware, to assist him in purifying the text of these Epistles, even after he was possessed of the Latin translation that so closely corresponds with the Medicean Greek. He has said nothing of the anxiety of Bishop Fell to obtain this version, nor of the exertions of Huntington, in the East, to procure it for him, not only after the edition of the Greek by Vossius, but also after the celebrated Defence of Bp. Pearson. He has never even hinted at Larroque's Reply to that Defence, although, as it will be seen as we proceed, he could not have been ignorant of it. He has thought the information conveyed in the following passage from my Preface not worthy of notice; but, as it shews

how far the next sentence which I am about to cite from the Reviewer is correct, I will transcribe it here:—"From that period "until the present time no further information relative to the "Syriac version of these Epistles seems to have been obtained. "The question, however, as to their genuineness and the two "different recensions, has of late years been renewed and discussed "with various shadows of opinions in Germany. The longer "edition has again found an advocate*: the shorter edition has "gained new supporters†: both have been denied to be perfectly "genuine; but still have been acknowledged, although altered "and changed from the original copy, to contain in them part, "if not the whole, of the genuine letters‡; and also their authen- "ticity has again been altogether questioned.§ The only hope, "therefore, of satisfactorily solving this difficulty still seemed to "be in the chance of this discovery of the ancient Syriac version, "made previously to the time when corruptions were introduced "into the text."

In page 321 the Reviewer writes—

In the year 1672, Bishop Pearson, in the Dedication of his "Vindiciæ Ignatianæ" to Archbishop Sheldon, presented the venerable Bishop of Antioch to the Primate of England, with a respectful supplication in his behalf "*ne pro impostore haberetur*;" and ever since that time the Ignatius of Ussher, of Vossius, and of Hammond has been regarded as the Ignatius of Eusebius, of Irenæus, of Polycarp, of St. John. To speak of no other testimonies to this effect, he has been proclaimed as such by the English theologian who most resembled Pearson in the depth of his erudition and the soundness of his judgment, Bishop Bull.

Most entirely do I concur in the "supplication" of Bishop Pearson respecting Ignatius, "ne pro impostore habeatur," (I think it right to quote the learned Bishop's words exactly);

---

* C. Meier, in Ullmann, Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1836. p. 340.

† Arndt. ibid. 1839, p. 136. Ric. Rothe, Die Anfänge der Christ. Kirche, p. 739.

‡ Neanders, Kirchengeschichte, Vol. i. 738; and the English Translation by H. J. Rose, Vol. ii. p. 334. Schmidt, Versuch über die gedoppelte Recension der Briefe des Ignatius; in Hencke, Magazin für Religions Philosophie, Vol. iii. p. 91. Netz, in Ullmann, Studien und Krit. 1835. p. 881. Car. Hase, in Kirchengeschichte, p. 88. Third Edition.

§ See Baur, in Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie 1836. fas. iii. p. 199. et 1838. fas. iii. p. 149.

but at the same time I would likewise offer a no less "respectful supplication": *ne impostor pro Ignatio habeatur.* I also agree with the Reviewer, "that ever since that time the Ignatius of Usher, of Vossius, and of Hammond has been regarded as the Ignatius of Eusebius, of Irenæus, of Polycarp, of St. John;" and I would add, of Origen also; but I think I have already brought forward evidence enough to shew, that the seven Letters which bear his name have not "ever since that time" met with the same favourable consideration.

In a note upon this passage, the Reviewer cites from Bishop Bull the following words:—

"Ignatii genuinas esse Epistolas septem Eusebio memoratas, ab Reve-
" rendissimo Usserio Latinè primùm ex duobus MSS. in Angliâ nostrâ reper-
" tis, dein ab eruditissimo Isaaco Vossio e Mediceo Codice (exceptâ tantum ad
" Romanos Epistolâ) Græcè editas, contra Blondellum satis probârunt Vossius
" ille et Hammondus, adversùs Dallæum verò ita copiosissimè demonstravit
" Episcopus Cestriensis ut *apud æquos arbitros* lis illa de Ignatianis et contro-
" versia *tota* jam *definita* videatur.*

Although the learned Bishop in these words says no more than that the dispute might then *seem* to be altogether decided, he subjoins to this another sentence, expressing his conviction on this head still more strongly, but which, even though it might appear to fortify the Reviewer's argument, he has altogether omitted. Is it because there occurs in that passage mention of a reply having been immediately made to the work of Bishop Pearson? This, at any rate, is a matter respecting which the Reviewer has been very cautious not to give the slightest information to his readers. But I will quote the sentence as it continues—"Neque enim quenquam
" φιλαληθῆ, qui in hoc literarum genere vel mediocriter versatus sit,
" de Epistolis illis tantillùm dubitare facient Sophisticæ *Observa-*
" *tiones*, quas in Pearsonum auctor anonymus anno 1674 Rotho-
" magi edidit. Frustrà omnino vir ille dispersos ac profligatos
" Dallæi sui ordines restituere atque instaurare nititur."

At page 323 the Reviewer writes—

Again, we know as a fact from the testimony of Polycarp, his friend and fellow-disciple, and brother bishop, and eventually his brother martyr, that Ignatius *did write Epistles:* we know also that Polycarp was in possession of copies of these Epistles, which he received from the hands of Ignatius himself, and that they were annexed by him to his own Epistle addressed to the Phi-

* Defensio Fidei Nicænæ, Sect. i. cap. ii. §. 7. edit. Grabe, p. 20.

lippians, and that the Epistle to which the Ignatian letters were attached was publicly read in the ecclesiastical assemblies of Asia to the time of St. Jerome. It is certain also that Irenæus, the scholar of Polycarp, and Bishop of Lyons, possessed Epistles of Ignatius; and it is an indubitable fact, that Eusebius and St. Jerome, living in the fourth century, had seven Epistles of Ignatius, and that these seven Epistles coincided in title and substance with those which we now possess. If, therefore, our seven *Greek* Epistles are not the genuine Epistles, we should be glad to know what has become of them?

I observe here that the Reviewer has again omitted to mention Origen, the only authority during the third century, who speaks twice of Ignatius by name, and quotes two passages from his Epistles. Is it because both of these passages are found in the Syriac version exactly as cited by him?

In the next page he proceeds:—

They were not letters to a *private* individual, but to *various public bodies*; they were addressed to *Churches;* kept in their archives; copies of them were sent from one Church to another; they were attached to an Epistle, that of Polycarp, *publicly read* in Christian Assemblies. We confidently affirm that an interpolator *in intention*, would have been unable to persuade the Church officers in different parts of the world to surrender their copies to him to be amplified to twice their original size; &c.

I pass over the Reviewer's illustration of this point, drawn from "Cathedral Chapters," and "sealed books of Common Prayer."

Now, I think that any simple and single-minded person, unacquainted himself with the facts of the case, and looking up to the Reviewer as a learned authority, could hardly draw any other inference from the words above cited than the following:—That Ignatius put into the hands of Polycarp, or at least sent to him, seven Epistles, which Polycarp attached to an Epistle of his own written to the Philippians, that these Epistles were copied by them and sent to other Churches, who likewise performed the same good office for their neighbours, carefully keeping their own copies in their "archives," under the custody of their "Church officers," and that they were publicly read in "the Christian assemblies."

I shall not stop to institute any inquiry respecting the existence of church* archives, the probable nature of their contents, or who

* The Reviewer is doubtless aware, that even the existence of buildings, set apart as churches, for the three first centuries, has been questioned by several learned men. See Bingham's Antiq. Book viii. ch. i. sect. 13.

might have been the "Church officers" that had the care of them, in the early times of the second, third, or even fourth century; but proceed to examine the grounds upon which the rest of the Reviewer's statements are based.

The first mention made of any thing written by Ignatius is in the following passage from the Epistle of Polycarp:—Ἐγράψατέ μοι καὶ ὑμεῖς καὶ Ἰγνάτιος, ἵνα ἐάν τις ἀπέρχηται εἰς Συρίαν, καὶ τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀποκομίσῃ γράμματα· ὅπερ ποιήσω, ἐὰν λάβω καιρὸν εὔθετον, εἴτε ἐγὼ, εἴτε ὃν πέμψω πρεσβεύσοντα καὶ περὶ ὑμῶν. Τὰς ἐπιστολὰς Ἰγνατίου τὰς πεμφθείσας ἡμῖν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄλλας ὅσας εἴχομεν παρ' ἡμῖν, ἐπέμψαμεν ὑμῖν, καθὼς ἐνετείλασθε· αἵτινες ὑποτεταγμέναι εἰσὶ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ταύτῃ· ἐξ ὧν μεγάλα ὠφεληθῆναι δυνήσεσθε. Περιέχουσι γὰρ πίστιν, καὶ ὑπομονὴν, καὶ πασᾶν οἰκοδομὴν τὴν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν ἀνήκουσαν. I quote these words as they are given by Eusebius,* taking it for granted that they are genuine, without waiting to consider any of the objections which have been brought against them,† from the circumstance of their not being found in any of the Greek copies of St. Polycarp's Epistle, of which several are extant, and also from their not agreeing perfectly with the Latin translation of this Epistle, as well as other weighty exceptions which have been taken against them. But allowing them to be entirely genuine, surely all that can be gathered from them is, that Epistles of Ignatius to him, and other letters, as many as he had by him (I am willing to allow that these also refer to letters by Ignatius, although the text has left it indefinite), St. Polycarp appended to his own Epistle, and sent them, together with it, to the Philippians. Not one word is said how many these Epistles were, or to whom they were addressed. This must have been in the year 107, or, according to Bishop Pearson, in the year 116 at the latest.

Neither Irenæus nor Origen, in quoting the words of St. Ignatius, ever once mention his letters, much less do they say any thing of the persons to whom they were sent. The next account therefore, at all definite, which we have of the Epistles of this holy martyr, is that given by Eusebius, who does not appear to have been quite sa-

---

* Hist. Eccl. lib iii. c. 36.

† See Hefele, Proleg. pp. 54. and 14. and Daillé, De Ignat. Epist. c. 32.

tisfied himself on this head, as he prefaces his notice of them with the words λόγος δ' ἔχει.* He speaks, however, of seven, or at least of six; and the names of the parties to whom they were addressed agree with the names of the same number out of the twelve found in the Antient Latin copies first published by Archbishop Usher, and five or six of those in the imperfect Greek copy of the Medicean Library. If, then, the recurrence of the names of three persons mentioned by Eusebius in three of these Epistles, and the citation of one passage from one Epistle, and of two more from another, be sufficient to warrant such a conclusion, "these seven Epistles coincided in title and substance with those which we possess."

It may, however, be worth while to remark here, that Eusebius styles Onesimus the *Pastor* (ποιμὴν) of the Church at Ephesus, and Polybius the *Ruler* (ἄρχων) of that at Tralles, while in the Epistles both of them are called *Bishop* (ἐπίσκοπος); but this may only be a rhetorical manner of expression, similar instances of which are observable in the Review now before us.

Moreover, in the passage as cited by Eusebius from the Epistle to the Romans, which is comprised in seventeen lines of Mr. Jacobson's edition, or fourteen of that of Hefele, there are no less than nine readings, varying from the Medicean text, one of which is the omission of two words, and another of one. In the next sentence cited by Eusebius from this same Epistle, consisting only of two lines, there are also two various readings, one of which is the omission of two words; and in the third passage quoted from the Epistle to the Smyrneans there are two variations, although it consists of not more than four lines.† These variations may seem

* It seems also to be quite evident, from the following passages, that Eusebius himself did not esteem the genuineness of the Epistles of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp to be equally established with that of the Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians, which was acknowledged by all:—Καὶ ὁ Πολύκαρπος δὲ τούτων αὐτῶν μέμνηται ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Φιλιππησίους ἐπιστολῇ. Book iii. c. 36. ὥσπερ οὖν ἀμέλει τοῦ Ἰγνατίου ἐν αἷς κατελέξαμεν ἐπιστολαῖς, καὶ τοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐν τῇ ἀνωμολογημένῃ παρὰ πᾶσιν, ἣν ἐκ προσώπου τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλήσιας τῇ Κορινθίων διετυπώσατο. ibid. c. 37. Ἡ μὲν οὖν τοῦ Κλήμεντος ὁμολογουμένη γραφὴ, πρόδηλος. Εἴρηται δὲ καὶ τὰ Ἰγνατίου καὶ Πολυκάρπου. ibid. c. 38.

† In making these collations I have used the Edition of Eusebius, by Dr. Burton, Oxford, 1838; and Mr. Jacobson's Edition of the Apostolic Fathers.

to be of no weight, and unworthy of consideration in the eyes of the Reviewer; but if we are to examine the question with that strict criticism which alone can help us to arrive at the truth in a question of such difficulty, they appear to me to be of great importance.

But to return to our subject, assuming the year 330, given by the Reviewer—although no doubt he is aware that this is a disputed question—as the time at which Eusebius wrote his history, and the date of the journey of St. Ignatius to Rome, to be A. D. 116, as advocated by Bishop Pearson, an interval of more than two hundred years must have elapsed between the mention of Letters from Ignatius to Polycarp and the first notice whatever that we have given us of the names of the other parties to whom any of his Epistles were said to have been addressed. Moreover, this was a period abounding in forgeries.

Jerome composed his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical writers about sixty years after Eusebius, according to Bishop Pearson, in A. D. 393*; and any thing which he has said on this subject is of no additional authority, for he copied almost word for word from Eusebius, as the learned Prelate just spoken of writes: "et reliqua Eusebiana fere omnia, tacito Eusebii nomine, transcripsit."† That his knowledge of the Ignatian Epistles was not accurate is plain, since, in his third book against the Pelagians‡, he quotes the words of the Letter attributed to St. Barnabas, and says that they belong to St. Ignatius.§ One passage from the Epistle to the Ephesians is referred to by Jerome, in his Commentary on St. Matthew‖; but this same passage had been cited before by Origen, in his sixth Homily on St. Luke: and since Jerome translated this very homily of Origen into Latin¶, he must of course have acquired a knowledge of these words of St. Ignatius from this source. In like manner, he seems to have borrowed those of the

* See Vindiciæ, p. 9. † Ibid. p. 10.

‡ See Edition of Erasmus, Vol. ii. p. 200.

§ See Menard's notes on the Epistle of Barnabas, p. 108. Bp. Pearson's Vindiciæ, p. 29. Cotelerius, Testimonia Veterum de Barnabæ Epistola, tom. i. p. 4.

‖ Chapter i. vers. 18. See Cotel. Test. de S. Ignatii Epist. Vol. ii. pp. 1. 3. Bp. Pearson's Vindiciæ, p. 10.

¶ See Fabricius, Bibliotheca Græca, Vol. v. p. 228.

Epistle of Barnabas, above mentioned, from the same writer, who has cited them at the end of his first book against Celsus*; for Jerome was well versed in Origen's works, and translated several of them into Latin.† He also, once again, mentions the name of Ignatius.‡ So far, then, as we have any evidence before us to decide upon the matter, it seems most probable that Jerome never saw the Ignatian Epistles; for the only accounts that he has given us of them are taken from other works, which we know that he had in his hands, and made much use of. The Reviewer therefore, in this place also, goes rather too far, when he states that "it is an indubitable fact that St. Jerome, living in the fourth century, had seven Epistles of Ignatius." I am sure the Reviewer himself must allow that it often happens that the words of an author are cited by persons who have never seen his books, or even been at the pains of verifying the quotations which they have taken from second-hand sources.

But to proceed: in his work on Ecclesiastical writers above mentioned, Jerome, when speaking of St. Polycarp, uses the words which the Reviewer has quoted in note 8, p. 323: *Scripsit Polycarpus ad Philippenses valde utilem Epistolam, quæ usque hodie in Asiæ conventu legitur;* by which he declares that a very useful Epistle of St. Polycarp was read about the year 393 in *Conventu Asiæ:* but not one word has he said respecting any Epistles of St. Ignatius being appended to it, or being read in a similar manner. It is highly improbable that he would have omitted altogether to notice such a fact, had he ever heard of it and believed in its existence, either when writing respecting this Epistle of St. Polycarp, or those of St. Ignatius.

I give, at the bottom of the page, a note of E. S. Cyprianus respecting the meaning of the words *Conventu Asiæ.*§

* See Origen against Celsus, Lib. 1. Vol. i. p. 378 edit. Benedict.

† Nam quod dicunt: Origenis me volumina compilare, et contaminari non decere Veterum scripta, quod illi maledictum vehemens esse existimant, eandem laudem ego maximam duco, cum illum imitari volo, quem cunctis prudentibus et vobis placere non dubito. *Hieronymus, Prologus in Secundum super Micheam,* Erasmus' Edition, Vol. vi. p. 119.

‡ See adversus Helvidium, Vol. ii. p. 12., and Pearson's Vind. p. 10.

§ Quem Asiæ conventum intelligat, difficulter cognoscitur. Sophronius reddit: ἐν τῇ Ασιάνῃ συνόδῳ. Constat igitur, non esse sermonem de conventibus Christianorum quotidianis, sed de notabili quodam totius Asiaticæ gentis conventu.

I believe I have now stated, as fairly as I can, the whole of the evidence respecting this matter, and I have given my authorities for the same. And what does it amount to? Simply to thus much: that St. Polycarp sent to the Philippians, at their request, Letters* which he had received from St. Ignatius, and other Letters—they also might have been from St. Ignatius, but it is not stated so—and that he subjoined them to an Epistle which he was then writing; but there is no account whatever of the parties to whom those other Letters were addressed—that more than two hundred years afterwards, for the first time, Eusebius mentions the names of seven parties to whom Letters of St. Ignatius were said (λόγος δ' ἔχει) to have been sent, and cites short passages from two, in which, nevertheless, there are several variations from the Reviewer's "received text" of these Epistles—that, about sixty years still later, Jerome repeats what Eusebius had said; alludes to one passage quoted in a work of Origen, which he himself had translated into Latin; makes a mistake with respect to another also cited by Origen, by putting into St. Ignatius' mouth words

---

conventu. De provinciis Romanorum ex Plinii libro x. epistolis LX, CI et aliunde novimus, quod diem illum, quo imperatores ad reipublicæ gubernacula admoti essent, quotannis magna religione ludisque ac spectaculis celebraverint, præeunte videlicet provinciæ præfecto, quem sequebantur milites ac legati civitatum, quos provinciales vocant Trajanus et Plinius. Hunc morem in Asia obtinuisse dubitari non potest, credoque hunc conventum ab Aurelio Antonino, lib. iv. Euseb. c. XIII. κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίης, *commune Asiæ* appellari, ut et Valesius sentit in notis ad illum Eusebii locum. Hunc quotannis conveniendi morem in Asia retentum fuisse arbitror, quum jam Christiani imperassent, adeoque κοινὸν Ἀσίας *commune Asiæ*, heic indigitari ab Hieronymo. In conventu enim illo Christianos primo omnium de religione consultare decebat, ac prælegere acta martyrum, præcipue vero epistolam sui primarii episcopi, Polycarpi, ut gentiles convenientium multitudine, ardore ac zelo, inducerentur ad amplectendam doctrinam salutarem; tum etiam ut Christiani confirmarentur admirando Polycarpi monumento, ac præpararentur ad sustinendas persecutiones, si quæ forte, ut Juliani tempore, supervenissent. Intelligo autem conventum Asiæ proconsularis, non Asiæ, quæ tertiam orbis terram partem notat. See *Hieronymi Catalogus Scriptorum Ecc. a E. S. C.* 4to. *Francof.* 1722. p. 245.

* This, in all probability, means only the one Epistle, which is come down to us, addressed to Polycarp, but containing also advice and admonition to the Smyrnæans who were under his charge.

which it appears he never uttered; once again mentions his name; and afterwards writes, that the Epistle of St. Polycarp was read, even to his own time, in *conventu Asiæ*.

Let us now see what the Reviewer makes of this. "The Epistles were addressed to various *Churches*, and copies of them were made by Polycarp, and annexed to an Epistle of his own, which was publicly *read in the Church*.—It is certain, also, that Irenæus, the scholar of Polycarp, and Bishop of Lyons, possessed Epistles of Ignatius; and it is an indubitable fact, that Eusebius and St. Jerome, living in the fourth century, had seven Epistles of Ignatius; and that these seven Epistles coincided in title and substance with those we now possess." From so little to make so much, surely the learned Reviewer must have drawn largely upon his own imagination.

At page 323 the Reviewer writes:

> This appears to us very unaccountable; and it becomes more so, when we consider carefully the recorded history of the Epistles of Ignatius, and endeavour to reconcile it with Mr. Cureton's theory. He acknowledges, as we have said, that they were preserved in their integrity till the time of Eusebius, who has described them in his "Ecclesiastical History," written about A.D. 330; but within thirty years after Eusebius wrote, they were interpolated (such is Mr. Cureton's conjecture), so as to assume at least twice their original bulk.

I must confess that I was much surprised when I first read this passage, in which I am stated to "acknowledge" what I never even thought of, and to be the author of a "conjecture" which never once occurred to me. I have never said that the Epistles were preserved in their integrity till the time of Eusebius; nor have I ever conjectured "that within thirty years after he wrote they were interpolated so as to assume at least twice their original bulk." I regret that I should have expressed myself so indistinctly as to have afforded scope for any one to draw such an inference. I have already observed, that had I been imprudent enough to make such an acknowledgment, or to utter such a conjecture, and it had proved to be altogether erroneous, this would only have been an indication of my own want of judgment, but it would not have affected the question as to the interpolations themselves. The Reviewer, however, seems determined to take this for granted; and then endeavours to build an

argument thereon, when he returns to the subject, at page 324, in the following words:—

And, further, let us observe the particular period in which this interpolation is imagined by Mr. Cureton to have taken place. It is in the interval between A.D. 330 and A.D. 360, or, at the latest, before A.D. 446, the year in which Theodoret wrote his Eranistes, in which they are largely cited; that is, precisely in the most brilliant period of Ecclesiastical literature; the age of Eusebius, of Jerome, one of whom lived till A.D. 340, and the other died A.D. 420, aged 91; and both of whom *have given a detailed account of these Epistles*; the age of Chrysostom, of the Gregories, of Basil, of Cyril; the age of Church historians, of Biblical commentators, of libraries, of museums, and of schools. Could the works of the venerable Ignatius have been so altered by addition, as Mr. Cureton supposes: and, even if no Eusebius or Jerome came forth to defend the writings of Ignatius, which they themselves had described, is it credible that no single voice should have been raised in that learned and stirring age, to restore the holy Martyr to himself?

I have already remarked that there are several variations in the passages cited by Eusebius, from the "received text." I will proceed now to examine those quoted 116 years later, according to the Reviewer's dates, by Theodoret. In the Epistle to the Smyrneans, in the well-known passage commencing Εἷς ἰατρός, κ.τ.λ.*, comprised in three lines and a half of Mr. Jacobson's edition, we find the following variations: Medicean Text, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος Θεὸς; Theodoret, ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ Θεὸς; Med. ἐν ἀθανάτῳ; Theod. ἐν θανάτῳ, adding, also, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν. In the same Epistle, in a passage of four lines, besides two slight variations†, Med. ἵνα τῷ πάθει τὸ ὕδωρ καθαρίσῃ; Theod. ἵνα τὸ θνητὸν ἡμῶν καθαρισθῇ.‡ In another, from the same, of three lines, cited by Theodoret, there are six variations from the Medicean text. In five lines from the Epistle to the Trallians§, quoted by him, there are six variations from the Medicean text. In two lines from that to the Smyrneans‖, besides the transposition of one word, and the addition of another, Theodoret reads, ὡς σαρκικῶς καὶ πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος, for ὡς σαρκικὸς, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος of the Medicean text. In six lines from the same Epistle¶ there are three variations; one, the transposition of the word ἀληθῶς; ano-

* See Jacobson's edit. p. 272. Usher's Disser. p. xvi.

† Jacobson, p. 288. Usher ibid. p. xix.

‡ Jacobson, p. 294. Usher, p. xx.

§ Jacobson, p. 334. Usher, p. xx.

‖ Jacobson, p. 404. Usher, p. xxiii.

¶ Jacobson, p. 400. Usher, p. xxiii.

ther, κατὰ θεοτήτα for κατὰ θέλημα; and the third, the omission of Θεοῦ. In another passage from the same, consisting* of four lines, there are four variations, one of which is the omission of με, and another, ὡς νεκροφόρον for ὢν νεκροφόρος. And again, in seven lines from this Epistle†, as cited by Theodoret, there are five variations, one being the omission of μεταξὺ θηρίων, μεταξὺ Θεοῦ, and another of γενομένου. Moreover, it is to be remarked, that the last-mentioned passages are said by Theodoret to be from the Epistle to the *Romans;* but in the "received text" they are found in that to the *Smyrneans.*‡

Thus I have examined the passages from the Ignatian Epistles, which the Reviewer says are "largely cited" by Theodoret. They consist in all of thirty-three lines of Mr. Jacobson's edition, or about twenty-five of that of Hefele; and in these we find more than twenty-five variations from the Medicean text, and some of them very considerable. To what extent, then, may we reasonably calculate that the difference between the "received text," and that of the copy made use of by Theodoret must have amounted in the whole collection of these Epistles? I leave the choice to the Reviewer to select which he pleases as most correct and genuine—the copy of Theodoret, or the "received text." How far the notice of these Epistles by Eusebius and Jerome corresponds with a "detailed account," may be judged from what has been said already.

The Reviewer calls this "precisely the most brilliant period of Ecclesiastical literature"—"the age of Chrysostom, of the Gregories," (Gregory Thaumaturgus had been dead at least sixty years), "of Basil, of Cyril." He does not tell us which Cyril, of Jerusalem or of Alexandria, although both flourished within the period which he specifies, and each well deserved to be distinctly mentioned. Neither has he said one word respecting the man whose opinion, of all others, would perhaps be of the most weight in the present question—Epiphanius. Is this because I have stated, as others have done before me, that we can scarcely avoid concluding that these Epistles must have been unknown, in their present form, to Epiphanius, who wrote about this time, or he

* Jacobson, p. 406. Usher, p. xxiii. † Jacobson, p. 406. Usher, p. xxv.
‡ See Usher. p. xxiii.

would hardly have failed to bring forward their authority against various heresies which he refutes?

But to return to the venerable Fathers whose names the Reviewer brings under our notice. Chrysostom, as he himself observes, "delivered a panegyric on Ignatius*;" and in that he quotes some words of this holy Martyr, and in another place he has cited a second passage: the former is from the Epistle to the Romans, and the latter from that to Polycarp, and both from the Greek text as it corresponds with the Syriac version†: but he has cited no words from any other of the Ignatian Epistles, or from any part of these which the Syriac does not recognise, and which doubtless are spurious. Not one of the rest of those great men whom the Reviewer has singled out for especial notice has ever said a word respecting this holy Martyr, or cited a passage from his Letters, excepting Basil, who‡ alludes to one passage from the Epistle to the Ephesians, which is also found in the Syriac; but in this he appears to have followed Origen, who quoted it before him, or perhaps Theophilus of Antioch, if Bishop Pearson be right in attributing to him a Commentary on St. Matthew.§ To use the Reviewer's words and argument, "Could the works of the venerable Ignatius have been so unknown and so neglected, that none of these Fathers should have mentioned them? Is it credible that no single voice should have been raised, in that learned and stirring age, to restore the holy Martyr to himself," and urge his justly-acknowledged authority?

The Reviewer tells us this was "the age of Church Historians." We have already spoken of Eusebius, who only lived during ten years of this period. The next in order is Philostorgius: his history has unfortunately perished. Then comes Socrates, who vouchsafes further information respecting Ignatius, which we do not gather from any of his predecessors; namely, that this holy Martyr was the first to institute choral singing in the churches, in imitation of a choir of angels, whom he had seen in a vision chaunting in heaven.‖ Then follow Sozomen and Theodoret

* This is given by Russel at the beginning of the second volume of his edition of the Apostolic Fathers.

† See Pearson's Vindiciæ, p. 9.

‡ Ibid. p. 5.

§ Ibid. p. 4.

‖ Soc. Eccl. Hist. Book 6. ch. 8.

himself. It is not necessary for me to offer any remarks upon the merit of these "Church Historians:" the extent of their works is well known. I only observe that they amount, even if we include Ruffinus, the translator of Eusebius, to no more than six* during a period of 116 years, according to the Reviewer's calculation, and that at least half of them were accused of much more dangerous heresy than other writers whose heterodoxy the Reviewer so strongly reprobates; and consequently, if his own theory be correct, they have probably given but mutilated accounts.† He tells us, further, this was the age of "Libraries, of Museums, and of Schools." Respecting Ecclesiastical museums I confess my entire ignorance. The learned Bingham‡ has given some account of schools and libraries: concerning the former he has not much to say. Of libraries he tells us that Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, built one in that city in the third century; that Julius Africanus founded another at Cæsarea, which was augmented by Pamphilus, who also had a collection of books of his own, as likewise had Jerome. Another library is mentioned, belonging to the Church of Cirta Julia, in Numidia. In the following ages, he notices that the library of the Church of Hippo was mentioned by St. Augustine, and observes that the "author of the Pontifical, if any credit may be given to him, ascribes the building of two to Pope Hilary, near the baptistery of the Lateran Church." Baronius also speaks of a library of George, Bishop of Alexandria, in the year 362.§ These appear to be all the libraries accessible during the period specified, of which any account had reached the learned Bingham; but the Reviewer seems to have furnished almost every town with a library, a museum, and a school; and, what is of more consequence for his cause, almost every Episcopal Church at least with a copy of the Epistles of St. Ignatius, to be kept in their "archives," under the charge of

* Athanasius, who wrote the life of St. Anthony, and Palladius, who has given an account of the monks of Egypt and Palestine, in his *Lausiaca*, can scarcely be classed as "Church Historians."

† "If he was a heretic he was likely to be an epitomist." Reviewer, p. 330.

‡ See Antiquities of the Christian Church, Book viii. ch. vii. sect. xii.

§ See "A Critical and Historical account of all the celebrated libraries, by a Gentleman of the Temple." 12mo. London, 1739, p. 73.

the "Church officers," as the "sealed books of common prayer" in our own cathedrals, in the custody of the Deans and Chapters.

But there were other schools in those days; and, if we may judge from the nature of the employment there, in all probability libraries connected with them, concerning which neither Bingham nor Lomeier*, to whom he refers for further instruction on this subject, have given any account, not having had the means of obtaining information respecting them. But I will mention them, because they might have been instrumental in preserving the Syriac version of the Epistles of St. Ignatius in their original uncorrupted form. I mean the schools in Mesopotamia, and particularly at Edessa; and amongst these the famous school, called the Persian School†, to which Christians came from Persia to study theology and the Syriac language. Epiphanius‡ refers to this before the end of the fourth century. Here Maanes studied at the commencement of the fifth century, and employed himself in the task of translation. Amongst other works, he rendered from the Greek into the Syriac the Commentaries of Theodorus of Mopsuesta, by which he acquired great fame.§ Rabulas, Bishop of Edessa, also translated into Syriac some of the writings of his friend Cyril of Alexandria.‖ Indeed, in the schools at Edessa, Nisibis, and in the monasteries in the neighbourhood, most of the Syriac translations of the Fathers of the Church, in the collection now belonging to the British Museum, seem to have been made, as it is quite certain that they were written there.

I have nothing to do with the remaining part of the Reviewer's paragraph, at page 325, as it does not concern matters of fact, but of opinion only. I would observe, however, that he writes as if he thought that books were almost as plentiful, and as easy to be procured in the fourth and fifth centuries, as they are in the pre-

* See *De Bibliothecis Liber singularis, auctore Jo. Lomeiero.* 12*mo. Zutph.* 1669.

† See the life of Alexander Acœmetes, in Acta Sanctorum 15 Janr. Vol. i. p. 1023. Assemani Bibliotheca Orientalis, tom. i. p. 204.

‡ See Epiphanius, Hæres. 66. edit. Petav. Vol. i. p. 629. Assemani Bibl. Orient. Vol. i. p. 351.

§ See Assemani, ibid. Vol. iii. p. 378.

‖ One of the works translated by him is in the British Museum, No. 14,557.

sent day; that controversialists were as ready to start up as he has been to hasten to this discussion; and that forgeries and misstatements would be as quickly detected as they are in the nineteenth century. There was, indeed, one person who wrote a particular treatise on the subject of forgeries and falsifications towards the end of the fourth century, Amphilochius, Bishop* of Iconium; but, unfortunately, almost every thing that he wrote has perished. Was it the information which his friends Basil and Gregory of Nyssa obtained from this work that prevented them from ever making use of the interpolated Letters of St. Ignatius?

In the same page the Reviewer brings forward what he terms, "a very strong argument *in favour* of the received Greek text of Ignatius, in the remarkable fact, that, of those writers who have questioned its genuineness, scarcely two hold the same opinion concerning it." But this does not seem likely much to advance his cause. All who have "questioned its genuineness" have held the same opinion on this head—that it was not genuine, although they might have differed in other particulars. It is surely, therefore, too much for the Reviewer to state, "then Daillé arose and contradicted Blondell, as Blondell had contradicted Salmasius; but now Mr. Cureton† comes forward and repudiates *all these opinions.*" There is, on the contrary, no contradiction whatever, but perfect consent: all *agree* as to the *fact* of falsification and interpolation, although they might have held some difference of opinion as to the period when this took place; probably because, having been the work of various times, it has thus afforded the grounds for such a variety of opinion. For my own part, I can only say that I have never once, in my Preface or elsewhere, alluded to any opinion of Salmasius, Blondell, or Daillé, on this point, much less "repudiated *all these opinions;*" and I ought to forgive the sarcasm of the next passage, for the honour which the Reviewer has done me in selecting my name from among so many others to be mentioned on a question of criticism together with such able

---

* Περὶ τῶν ψευδεπιγράφων τῶν παρὰ αἱρετικοῖς: fragmentum servatum in VII Synodo, actione v. See Fabricius, Bibl. Græc. Vol. 7. p. 505.

† The Reviewer appears to be ignorant of the opinion which Whiston has expressed on this subject more than a century ago. See p. 58. below.

scholars. The Reviewer repeats what he had just before said, in the following words:—

In the mean time, we beg leave to suggest, that the great discrepancies which prevail among those who contend against the genuineness of the received Epistles, ought to be admitted as a strong argument in their favour.

Now, if this mode of reasoning be correct, let us see whither it must carry us. Bp. Pearson, Daillé, and others, differ in opinion as to the period of the fabrications of the works which go under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite. This, therefore, "ought to be admitted as a strong argument in their favour:" or to come to more recent days, there "has been a great deal of disputing about"* who wrote Εικων Βασιλικη; this, therefore, is "a strong argument in favour" of the authorship of King Charles, whose name this book bears.

At page 326 the Reviewer continues in the following words:—

It may here, indeed, be objected, in support of Mr. Cureton's hypothesis, that a similar interpolation to that which he has supposed, has *actually taken place*, according to our own shewing; for, from the year 1557 to 1646, when the edition of Vossius first appeared, the Ignatian Epistles were known to the world *only in that interpolated form* in which they are found in the two MSS. of Augsburg and Caspar Nydpryck. But we reply, that the difference between *this* interpolation and that imagined by Mr. Cureton, is only, in truth, another proof that the interpolation alleged by him is no interpolation at all. For how do we prove the former to *be an* interpolation? Mainly, from the fact, that none of the matter by which it differs from the received Greek text, can be shewn to have been quoted by *any author before the sixth century*. It was, therefore, *unknown* to the first five centuries after Christ.

If this argument be worth any thing—but I confess I do not hold its value to be very considerable—it makes entirely for the cause of the Syriac version, and shews the Medicean text to be interpolated. "For, (to use the Reviewer's own words,) how do we prove the latter to be an interpolation? Mainly from the fact, that none of the matter by which it differs from the Syriac text can be shewn to have been quoted by any *author before the fourth century*. It was, therefore, *unknown* to the first three centuries." The next sentence, in which the Reviewer speaks of "passages which are not found in the Syriac," will be considered in the sequel. The paragraph terminates with these words—

* Bishop Burnet's History of his own time: quoted by Todd in the title-page of his Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The difference between the longer Greek copy and the shorter, and that between the shorter and the Syriac, was unknown to the first five centuries; and the same argument which proves the former to be an *interpolated* work, shews the latter to be an *epitome*.

I do not understand this passage myself, and leave it, therefore, for the readers' consideration. I will only observe, that there is no evidence whatever for the existence either of the Longer or Shorter Greek copies for two centuries after the death of St. Ignatius. No one after Polycarp, who spoke of the Letter addressed to himself, has ever mentioned the names of these Epistles till the time of Eusebius; and all that had been cited as from Ignatius, before that period, belongs to the Syriac recension.

In the next sentence he continues—

And here we are led to observe, that Mr. Cureton has, most fortunately for the sake of Ignatius, appended extracts from *various other* Syriac MSS. in the Tattam collection, to his Syriac version of the *three Epistles*, derived from two MSS.

I merely quote this passage as an admission, on the Reviewer's part, of the weakness of his own cause; that he would have found some difficulty to make out a case, if the question of the Syriac version had been left simply to its own merits, and I had not, "most fortunately for the sake of Ignatius, appended these extracts." But these extracts, it will be seen, have really nothing whatever to do with the question, because the authors by whom they are cited lived more than a century after the period at which it seems certain the Ignatian Epistles must have assumed very nearly the form in which they are found in the Medicean text; and they are evidently cited from the interpolated recension, which appears to have been common in the fifth and sixth centuries. I have spoken of this in my Preface. My object in giving these extracts was to lay before the public every thing that I found in this Syriac collection in any way respecting St. Ignatius.

A little further, the Reviewer writes that one of these extracts "is, in fact, ANOTHER Syriac version of one of the Epistles." Here we see the reason for the change of the definite for the indefinite article at the commencement of his paper. But why did not the Reviewer state, for the benefit of his readers, of which Epistle there is "ANOTHER Syriac version," and how it came into the place where it is found? But I will explain this matter for him. It is a part of the Epistle to the Romans, usually inserted in the acts of

the martyrdom of St. Ignatius, of which I have spoken at p. ix. of my Preface. It belongs to a totally different class of MSS., is written in a Nestorian hand, on paper of about the eleventh or twelfth century*, and was evidently translated, together with the acts of martyrdom, at a much later period. Copies of this martyrdom, and the Epistle to the Romans inserted in it, have also been translated into Coptic.† The Reviewer again manifests a degree of courage, which to me appears almost unaccountable, when he says "that *this* OTHER Syriac version does *not* correspond with *Mr. Cureton's* Syriac version, but it *does* correspond with the Greek." It is a coarse translation, made by some one who does not appear to have well understood the Greek; and, according to my notion of the word, *corresponds* neither with the Syriac nor the Greek. In the first line of the Inscription it reads, *magnified in the greatness of the most high*, for *pitied in the greatness of the Father most high*, of both Greek and Syriac. In the third line it adds *God*, which is not found in the Greek; in the fourth it omits *our God*, after Jesus Christ, of the Greek; in the fifth it has nothing to correspond with χωριον, &c. In the second line of the Epistle it adds, *in the body*, which is not found in the Greek; and so on. But in two places it confirms the reading Χριστόνομος for Χριστώνυμος, according to the Syriac, and the *Christi habens legem* of the Latin version of the English MSS.; and also, *again am I voice*, of the Syriac, and *rursus factus sum vox*, of the same Latin version, instead of the evidently corrupt reading in the Greek, πάλιν ἔσομαι τρέχων.‡ Nor is the statement which the Reviewer has made, that "*all*" the other extracts which I have given, "accurately correspond with the *Greek* Text," at all more correct. I will not trouble my readers by pointing out the several variations, which perhaps, after what has been said, they will not think necessary, but I refer them to the notes to my

* Mr. Forshall, in the Catalogue of Syriac MSS. in the British Museum, attributes this MS. to the thirteenth century: Codex bombycinus formæ quartæ majoris admodum mutilus . . . . sæculo ut videtur decimo tertio. (Cod. 7200. Rich.) See Cat. Codd. MSS. Orientt. pars. 1. p. 92.

† See Assemani Bibl. Orient. Vol. i. p. 618.

‡ See a note on this passage in my book, p. 94.

volume, in which I have mentioned some of these differences, and beg them to make the comparison for themselves.

The Reviewer continues—

> What, then, is the age and authority of these *extracts*? Happily this question is readily answered. Some of them are taken, as their title shews, from the works of *Severus*, Patriarch of *Antioch*, and of *Timotheus*, Bishop of *Alexandria*. Severus became Bishop of Antioch in A.D. 513, and Timotheus was raised to the See of Alexandria in A.D. 519, and died A.D. 535; so that these passages were quoted before the middle of the sixth century.

Now, inasmuch as there have been no less than three Patriarchs of Alexandria, who bore the name of Timotheus,* in the course of about sixty years, the Reviewer would have done well to examine the matter before he decided to which of the three the extracts in question belong, so as to found any argument thereon. They certainly do not appertain to "Timotheus Asterius," whom he has fixed upon, as it is evident from a statement of faith sent by this author to the Emperor Leo †, who had been dead about five and forty years before Timotheus Asterius was raised to the Patriarchate.‡

In page 327 the Reviewer writes—

> It is clear, therefore, (because quoted by Severus in his Sermons) that the *Greek* recension which we now possess of the Ignatian Epistles was received as genuine in the *Church* of *Ignatius* himself in the sixth century; and that the *Syriac* version now offered to us as "representing most nearly what Ignatius wrote," was not known there as such at that period. And it may similarly be shewn, from the citations of Timotheus, that it was not received at Alexandria any more than at Antioch; and therefore it is highly probable that it did *not exist* so early as the beginning of the *sixth century*.

Although the Syriac language, as well as the Greek, was still spoken at Antioch in the time of Severus, all the sermons of that Patriarch, and his other works, so far as we know, were written in the latter: he would hardly, therefore, cite a "*Syriac* version." The shorter interpolated Greek recension, as I have already observed, appears not to have been uncommon at that period, although there is a difference worth remarking between the passages that Severus cites, and those which answer to them in the "received

---

* See L'Art de Vérifier les dates, Vol. i. pp. 234. 236. 240.

† See Add. MS. 12,156. fol. 62.

‡ See ibid, p. 404.

text." Nay, even Severus himself points out the circumstance of the existence of different and older copies than that which he seems generally to have used, if not of different recensions, when he writes, in the extract from his book against Grammaticus, at p. 29: "Permit me to be an *imitator* of the sufferings of my God." *But it is found in other copies than these, which are rather older, thus:* "Permit ye me to be a *disciple* of the sufferings of my God." The "*Syriac* version" was scarcely likely to be known at Alexandria, where that language was altogether foreign.

But before dismissing this subject, I will observe that, if the Reviewer's argument be good with respect to one Patriarch of Antioch, and one recension of the Ignatian Epistles, it must also hold good with respect to another Patriarch of Antioch, and another recension of the Ignatian Epistles. Among several who have cited the Longer interpolated Epistles in the sixth century, is Anastasius, Patriarch of Antioch.* To apply the Reviewer's argument, "it is clear, therefore, that the *Longer* Greek recension, which we now possess, of the Ignatian Epistles, was received as genuine in the *Church* of *Ignatius* himself in the sixth century, and that the *Shorter* recension was not known there at that period."

At page 328 there is a passage not very clear: I therefore, for the sake of illustration, place in juxta-position with it another occuring at page 339.

We do not *now* say that *interpolation* in the *one* case, or *omission* in in the other, was *per se* probable, *à priori;* but supposing it to be so, we do affirm, that *omission* in the *Syriac* was more probable than interpolation in the *Greek.*

Let us here observe, by the way, as a general proposition, that *omission* appears to us much more probable, *à priori*, than *interpolation;* and that there is, therefore, an abstract greater verisimilitude that the Syriac should be an abridged text than the Greek an interpolated one.

The Reviewer, I suppose, intends from this to draw an argument from probability. I will not stop to examine with what success, as it is my purpose to deal only with facts, and not with probabilities. According to the Reviewer's own confession, we have one instance of interpolation in the Longer recension of these very Ignatian Epistles; and if the authorities which I have given in the

* See Archbp. Usher's Dissertation, p. xxxiii.

Appendix, and even Bishop Pearson* himself be not mistaken in their criticism, we have another instance of interpolation even in the Shorter recension of the same Epistles. In the case, therefore, under our immediate consideration, the truth of facts seems to preponderate, rather than the "verisimilitude" of probability.

In the same page the Reviewer writes—

> Translation is a laborious work: it is very irksome, as St. Jerome says, to speak "*alieno stomacho non suo*;" and to translate many passages *similar* to each other might seem, perhaps, to be as needless as the introduction of them would certainly have been. We think, therefore, that *omission* in the Syriac was *more probable* than *insertion* in the Greek.

However "laborious a work" translation may be, surely the task of translating these three Epistles, which altogether do not amount to so much as some of St. Paul's single Epistles, could not have been very great, nor in any way worthy of being compared with the labour of Jerome, who, besides rendering the whole of the Scriptures from their original languages into Latin, translated also several other important and extensive works from the Greek. But to say nothing of this, I think any one, who will trouble himself to examine into the matter, will agree with me, that it must have been a far more laborious and difficult task to make such an abridgment from "the received Greek text" as these Syriac Epistles exhibit, than to have translated them entirely through and through. The Reviewer, in a later part of his article, wishes to shew that it is an epitome, made by design for heretical purposes, and, consequently, requiring much diligence and attention: in this place he endeavours to account for it being an abridgment, on the ground of avoiding trouble and labour. This brings me to another statement made by him.

> But Mr. Cureton affirms that we know "*no instances* of such *abridgment* in any Christian writer," whereas, he alleges, the examples of interpolation are very numerous.

I know not what right the Reviewer, or any other person, has to take my words and put upon them his own peculiar construction, and give them his own emphasis. I wrote the passage,

* See p. 18 above.

"no instances of such abridgment;" and I think that any single-minded person, and for such only I wished to write, could hardly have failed, if he must make any thing emphatic, to read it, "no instances of *such* abridgment," the peculiar nature of which, if it could be an abridgment, I had spoken of previously. This, therefore, renders it needless for me to make any remark relative to the Reviewer's notion of a Latin abridgment of the Apocryphal Epistle attributed to St. Barnabas, or of his strange idea of the "suppression of the Gospel of St. John," by certain heretics, being an "effectual abridgment."

But I think I ought not to pass over the following words of the Reviewer, although they do not materially affect my present argument, further than to give my readers caution not to place too much reliance upon any passage cited apart from the context.

> He must pardon us for believing, that what happened frequently to *profane* writings, might *sometimes* happen to Christian ones. Our historical and critical readers will remember the words of the immortal Casaubon, in his famous Dedication of his Polybius to Henry IV. of France, concerning the treatment of classical authors by Byzantine literati: "accessit pestis alia *compendiorum* et *epitomarum* confectio, quod genus scriptionis ut ad privatum conficientium usum non parvas utilitates habeat, ita publice noxium et magnis scriptoribus semper fuit exitiosissimum." And if such *epitomes* were so common of *historical* works, were they never made of *theological*?

For my part, I had no recollection of the passage of Casaubon just cited: perhaps I might never have read it before; at any rate, I had forgotten it. But I, nevertheless, strongly suspected, from the place where it occurred, that it could have but very little reference to the subject before us. I had, therefore, the curiosity to turn to the place; and to save such of my readers as may be unwilling to take this trouble for themselves, I give here the result of my search, which I cannot do better than in quoting Casaubon's own words: "Sic Con-
" stantinus Porphyrogenitus, memorati Leonis, uti reor, filius, quum
" animadverteret et historicorum scriptorum numerum innumerum
" circumferri, adeo ut multi sua ætate voluntatem cognoscendi res
" gestas simul cum spe abjicerent tot volumina unquam perle-
" gendi; conquisitis undique maxima cura et diligentia omnibus
" ejus generis auctoribus, qui poterant adhuc in Græciæ et Orientis
" Bibliothecis reperiri, corpus historicum præcepit concinnari, in
" partes ceu communes locos LIII tributum, quod Politicis homi-

" nibus rerum ipsis cognitu necessariarum Thesaurum quendam " inæstimabilem, et ut ille ait, pransum paratum exhiberet. . . . . " Sed crederetne aliquis ipsum illud consilium, quod a Principe " esset profectum Historiæ amantissimo, inter præcipuas causas " Historiæ perdendæ fuisse? atqui ita evenit tamen. Nam ubi " semel Corpus illud historicum in Politicorum usum ab eo con- " cinnatum, versari in manibus hominum est cœptum; è vestigio " nobilissimi quique Historiæ scriptores antiquiores, (ex talibus " utique flores illi fuerant decerpti) pristinam suam dignationem " amiserunt; et monumenta æternitati consecrata, tot nobilium in- " geniorum, ubi desita sunt legi, etiam describi, quod erat necesse, " desierunt: Accessit et pestis alia, etc." It appears, therefore, that the passage cited may refer as much to "Christian writings" as to "profane ones," but that it can hardly apply to this Syriac version of the Epistles of St. Ignatius, which must have been made nearly four centuries before. Constantine Porphyrogenitus mounted the Imperial throne of Constantinople A. D. 912*, and the Syriac version was transcribed soon after A. D. 500. It would have been more to the Reviewer's purpose to have mentioned the *epitome* of the Clementines, given together with both the recensions of the Ignatian Epistles, by Coleterius, in his *Patres Apostolici*, the summary of Epiphanius' Panarium, the *epitome* of the Divine Institutions of Lactantius, or of the history of Philostorgius made by Photius, with various other *epitomes* of "*Theological* works," which it would not be difficult to specify.

I have hitherto given the reader several opportunities of seeing the learned Reviewer's powers of making the most of his materials: I come now to shew his skill in diminution. In page 330 he writes—

> But we are assured by Mr. Cureton, that all the passages cited from the Ignatian Epistles by Christian writers, to the time of Eusebius, inclusively, are *taken* from these Epistles, with the exception of one citation from the Epistle to the Smyrneans, of which the Syriac version has not reached us; and that all the passages so cited are found in this Syriac translation. On this first assertion we must first observe, that the remnants of Christian antiquity of the second and third centuries are very scanty, and that the *direct citations* from

* See l'Art de Vérifier les dates. Vol. i. p. 430.

Ignatius by *name* in those writings do not amount in all to more than *two ;* so that no argument, either one way or the other, can justly be drawn from them.

Here I must differ most widely from the learned Reviewer. There are *three* citations during this period. One by Irenæus in the second century, and two by Origen in the third; and these are the only evidence that we have of the existence of any writings of St. Ignatius for a period of more than two hundred years. And if these have been urged in proof of the genuineness of a collection of *seven* Epistles, because these passages, cited by such antient writers, are found in two of the seven, surely they afford much stronger evidence in favour of the genuineness of a collection of only three Epistles, in two of which all the passages so cited are found; while the third is the only Epistle that was ever distinctly mentioned for more than two hundred years after the holy Martyr's death. The case stands thus. Origen cites two passages from Ignatius, by *name;* these are found, one in the Epistle to the Romans, the other in that to the Ephesians. Irenæus speaks in such terms as to leave no doubt whom he intended; while Eusebius* says expressly it was Ignatius, and the words which he quotes are also found in the Epistle to the Romans. Polycarp writes that he had received a letter or letters from Ignatius. The Sylloge of Epistles, written in the vernacular language of St. Ignatius himself, recently discovered, but transcribed several centuries before any other known copy, consists of precisely these three Epistles, and these three only. If, therefore, this be an epitome of *seven* genuine Greek Epistles, made more than two hundred years after the "detailed description" given by Eusebius, as the Reviewer is anxious to prove, this Asiatic epitomizer must not only have been endowed with most admirable prudence to select, from *seven* mentioned by Eusebius, precisely the *only three* for which there was any testimony in early Christian antiquity, but he must also have been gifted with an almost incredible degree of

---

* Οἶδε δὲ αὐτοῦ (Ἰγνάτιου) τὸ μαρτύριον καὶ ὁ Εἰρηναῖος, καὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν αὐτοῦ μνημονεύει λέγων οὕτως, ὡς εἶπέ τις τῶν ἡμετέρων διὰ τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν μαρτυρίαν καταριθεὶς πρὸς θηρία: ὅτι σῖτος εἰμὶ Θεοῦ: κ.τ.λ. See Euseb. book iii. c. 36.

foresight and sagacity, to omit those very passages from these three Epistles, which European critics, more than a thousand years afterwards, were likely to object against as unsuited to the age and character of St. Ignatius.

But Bishop Pearson has advanced a conjectural argument, which it has fallen in the Reviewer's purpose in this place to pass by altogether in silence. He prefaces it with these words: "Luculentissi-" mis hisce testimoniis tres conjecturas subjungendas putavi, ex " eodem sæculo petitas: quæ si eruditis placeant, bene est: mihi " certè placent, ut conjecturæ scilicet, neque alio nomine propono."* These three conjectures consist in apparent imitations of the words of Ignatius by other writers: two are taken from the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna relative to the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, and the third from a Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, written, as the learned Prelate supposes, by Theophilus, the sixth Bishop of Antioch. These three also, if the allusion be certain, refer to two of the three Epistles of the Syriac version. The last of them, indeed, is so clear, that it almost amounts to a direct citation. The words attributed to Theophilus are, *Quartò, ut partus ejus falleret diabolum, putantem Jesum de uxoratâ, non de virgine natum;* to which Basil referring, according to the authority of the same Prelate†, writes: Εἴρηται δὲ τῶν παλαιῶν τινι καὶ ἕτερος λόγος, ὅτι ὑπερ τοῦ λαθεῖν τὸν ἄρχοντα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου τὴν παρθενίαν τῆς Μαρίας ἡ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ἐπενοήθη μνηστεία. The words of Ignatius are, Ἔλαθεν τὸν ἄρχοντα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἡ παρθενία Μαρίας.‡ These allusions or imitations of the Greek Epistles of St. Ignatius, all of which correspond with the Syriac, the Reviewer has thought it prudent to pass over altogether without notice. We come now to consider others, adduced by Bp. Pearson§ in a later part of his work, and for a different purpose, which he does mention.

Bishop Pearson affirms that Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, *imitates* Ignatius, as well he might do, considering his relation to the Epistles and to their author. Bishop Pearson cites two passages, (and to these may be

---

* See Vindiciæ, p. 4.

† See Vindiciæ, p. 5.

‖ See my edition, p. 79.

§ See Vindiciæ, p. 79.

added a third) in which there is apparently such an imitation; and not one of the parallels to these passages is found in the *Syriac*, but they are all in the Greek.

I will now lay these "parallels," as pointed out by the Reviewer, before the reader, and leave him to draw his own conclusions.

Polycarp.	Ignatius.
1.	1.
τοὺς ἐνειλημμένους τοῖς ἁγιοπρεπέσι δεσμοῖς, ἅτινά ἐστι διαδήματα τῶν ἀληθῶς, κ.τ.λ. Epist. to Phil. ch. 1. edit. Jacobson, p. 466.	ἐν ᾧ τὰ δεσμὰ περιφέρω, τοὺς πνευματικοὺς μαργαρίτας. Epist. to Ephes. ch. 2. p. 280.
2.	2.
καὶ οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ἡμᾶς ἀπόστολοι, καὶ οἱ προφῆται οἱ προκηρύξαντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ Κυρίου. Ch. 6. p. 478. ibid.	καὶ τοὺς προφήτας δε ἀγαπῶμεν, διὰ τὸ καὶ αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατηγγελκέναι, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλπίζειν. Phil. ch. 5. p. 380. οὓς οὐκ ἔπεισαν αἱ προφητεῖαι, οὐδὲ ὁ νόμος Μωσέως, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μέχρι νῦν το εὐαγγέλιον. Smyrn. ch. 5. p. 406.
3.	3.
Confido enim vos bene exercitatos esse in sacris literis, et nihil vos latet. Ch. 12. p. 487.	Ὃν οὐδὲν λανθάνει ὑμᾶς, ἐὰν τελείως εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἔχητε τὴν πίστιν. Ephes. ch. 14. p. 284.

Such are the supposed imitations by St. Polycarp of the Epistles of St. Ignatius which the Reviewer advances in support of his argument. He next proceeds—

Again, Bishop Bull asserts, with a great show of probability, that Tertullian, in the second century, has translated a striking passage of Ignatius; this also is *not* in the Syriac, but *is* found in the *Greek*.

In referring to this passage again, at page 342, the Reviewer writes more boldly—

This sentence, according to Bishop Bull, was translated by Tertullian in the second century.

I will now quote that learned Prelate's words, and then place the passages of Ignatius and Tertullian in juxta-position, and leave

my readers to make their own comparison. "Ego autem plane "persuasum habeo, Tertullianum (qui ex Græcis Ecclesiæ scripto- "ribus multùm profecit) hîc respexisse et magna ex parte tran- "scripsisse celebrem Ignatii locum, quem ex Epistola ad Ephesios "supra adduximus . . . . . ut Græcum textum pœne ad "verbum Latine vertisse videatur Tertullianus." *

Ignatius.	Tertullian.
Εἷς ἰατρός ἐστιν, σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικὸς, γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος Θεὸς, ἐν ἀθανάτῳ ζωῇ ἀληθίνῃ, καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ, πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής. Epist. to Ephes. ch. 7. p. 272.	Ita utriusque substantiæ census hominem et Deum exhibuit: hinc natum, inde non natum; hinc carneum, inde spiritualem; hinc infirmum, inde præfortem; hinc morientem, inde viventem. Quæ proprietas conditionum, divinæ et humanæ, æqua utique naturæ veritate cujusque dispuncta est, eadem fide et spiritus et carnis. — *De carne Christi*, ch. 5.

Having thus laid before my readers the passages in question, I leave it to their own judgment to decide how far that most learned Prelate's opinion on this point is judicious; at the same time I observe, that, even were the resemblance certain — were it so striking as to be immediately remarkable—or even did it amount to positive translation, if there be otherwise good grounds, from different sources, to suspect that the Ignatian Epistles have been interpolated subsequently to the time of Tertullian, there is just as much reason to believe that the interpolator borrowed from Tertullian, as that Tertullian borrowed from Ignatius. Besides, we have no evidence whatever, from any of Tertullian's writings, that he was at all acquainted with the Epistles of Ignatius†; and further, to adopt the Reviewer's peculiar mode of arguing, "is it probable" that he should have cited "the works of the venerable

* Defensio Fidei Nicænæ. Sec. ii. cap. vii. §. 3. edit. Grabe, p. 87.

† Daillé and others have written to shew that Tertullian was ignorant of the existence of the Ignatian Epistles. See, De Ignatii Epistolis, cap. viii. p. 277.

Ignatius," without giving to his argument the additional weight and authority of such a name? Moreover, this very passage, as we have seen above, labours under the disadvantage of considerable variations, made by every one who has cited it. I believe it to be a violation of every rule of true criticism, to adduce such imaginary and uncertain allusions as furnishing any "chronological data." Nothing, therefore, which the Reviewer has yet brought forward would in the slightest degree have affected "a theory which assigned the interpolation to the close of the *fourth* century," even had I propounded such a theory. *Some* of the passages in the Epistle to the Ephesians, so far as I am able to form any opinion, *seem* to have been introduced between A. D. 330 and A. D. 360; and since the publication of my volume I have found that Whiston, who, like the learned Morin* and others, maintained that the shorter or Medicean text is an epitome of the longer, arguing upon other data, has arrived at the conclusion, that the shorter recension assumed its present form just at this very period. I quote that very learned writer's words—"And now, if, after all, "any one desires to know about what time in the fourth century I "suppose these Smaller Epistles to have been framed, I answer, "not till after A. D. 340, or the death of the great Eusebius, "during whose lifetime such ignorant heretics as Marcellus were "less considerable, and yet several years before A. D. 359, when "they are quoted as then known by Athanasius. †

In page 331 the Reviewer writes—

It is also stated by Mr. Cureton that there is no internal evidence of *omissions* having been made in the Syriac version, that there are no gaps or rough places in it, and that the Epistles run smoothly on in that version in an equable and harmonious flow from beginning to end.—Again we are obliged to inquire, *Is* this really the case? That which must strike every reader of these Epistles in the Syriac version is their *abrupt conclusion.* No salutations to

---

* Interim tamen non est omittendum nobilem in Theologiâ Criticum Johannem Morinum, collatis diversis editionibus ex Augustano et Florentino codicibus depromptis, in aliam planè diversam, maximèque mirandam sententiam incidisse. *Antiqua*, inquit, *Ignatiarum Epistolarum editio genuinum textum nobis exhibet, nova verò mancum et interpolatum.* See Pearson's Vind. p. 18.

† See Whiston's Dissertation upon the Epistles of Ignatius, in Primitive Christianity, Vol. i. p. 93.

friends, no adieus, no benedictions, are uttered or thought of; but the writer vanishes from our sight, in a most unceremonious manner, in the midst of a sentence, which does not prepare us in the least for his disappearance. This is not the demeanor of a Christian Bishop. How different is it from the Apostolic Epistles, which slope gently, and softly, and sweetly, to their conclusion! How different, again, from the Epistles of St. Clement, of St. Polycarp, and St. Barnabas! How different from every *one* of the *Greek* Epistles of St. Ignatius! Surely Mr. Cureton will allow us to observe, that there *is* strong evidence of *omission* here.

I think any person reading this passage without my volume before him could scarcely fail to draw the conclusion that all the three Epistles terminated without any "salutation, or adieu," while the truth of the case is that only one of them does. And although I might reply generally to this objection in various ways —that the greeting being given at the beginning of these Letters there is no necessity for it to be repeated at the end; that the omission of the valediction was not uncommon*; that, even supposing it to be lost, it would not affect the question which we are considering; that St. Ignatius, being bound as prisoner among ten soldiers, of whose ill-treatment, "by sea and by land, by night and by day," he seems to have had such good reason to complain, might have been urged, interrupted, and compelled to break off before he could finish all that he wished to say;—and although I may allege, —especially in the case of the Epistle to the Ephesians, of which alone of the three Letters the end can be deemed abrupt,—that this holy man, having been led to speak of the cross of Christ, of His immaculate conception by the Virgin frustrating the cunning of Satan, of the destruction of his antient kingdom, when the Son of God appeared as man, and of His victory even over that death, which he knew he himself was about so soon to suffer, might suddenly have closed his letter in the transport of zeal, which this prospect excited—Although any one of these reasons may be sufficient to account for such abruptness;—and although it is quite unnecessary to seek for any such reasons if the fact itself be established; I

* The omission of the valediction could not denote any want of regard or respect, for it is not added to any one of the Epistles of Pliny to Trajan, who lived at this very period.

would rather refer my readers to the concluding words of two Epistles, all of which must be familiar to them, and leave them then to judge how the Reviewer's arguing applies. "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins:" St. James, v. 20. "This is true God and eternal life. Little children, keep yourselves from idols:" 1 John v. 21. Shall we add here the Reviewer's words? "No salutations to friends, no adieus, no benedictions, are uttered or thought of, but the writer vanishes from our sight in a most unceremonious manner, in the midst of a sentence which does not prepare us in the least for his disappearance. This is not like the demeanour of a Christian Bishop. How different is it from the Apostolic Epistles which slope gently and softly and sweetly to their conclusion!"

The Reviewer proceeds, p. 332—

> But to turn from the *end* of the Epistles to the *body* of them. Mr. Cureton says that by the removal of the passages in the Greek, which are not found in the Syriac, "not only no obscurity is caused, nor the tenor of the Epistles broken, but, on the contrary, several places which before were *unintelligible, become now clear, the whole Epistle runs on uninterruptedly*, each sentence adheres closely to what precedes it." Let us test this assertion by one or two trials. In the Syriac version of the Epistle to the Ephesians we read the following words:—"Blessed is he who hath given you such a Bishop as this, as ye deserve. But because love suffereth me not to be silent from you, for this reason I *have been* forward to beg of you that ye will be diligent in the will of God."—p. 13. We examine the *preceding* part of the Epistle as it stands in the Syriac in quest of any paragraphs in which the writer "*has been* forward" to beg of them to be thus diligent, but *in vain:* we do not find there a single word to this effect! But let us now turn to the *Greek* text. *There* we *do* find the very admonitions which we have been seeking for in the Syriac to no purpose. He exhorts them there "to be united in the same mind, and in the same judgment, and to submit to their Bishops and Presbyters."

Before making any other remarks upon this passage, I am sorry to be obliged again to observe that the Reviewer here also has taken the liberty of altering my words. I wrote, "each sentence adheres closely to *that which* precedes it," namely, *sentence*. But the Reviewer has represented my words, "closely *to what* precedes it," referring it to the matter of the Epistle; and this change is

essential to his argument, which is not founded upon any want of coherence in the consecutive sentences, but in the supposed omission of some "admonitions" from the Syriac, which the Reviewer professes to have found in the Greek, but not in the foregoing sentence, or even that which precedes it, but in another chapter. A similar observation may be made with respect to the change in my words of "*the* Bishop," to "*their* Bishop," with reference to the Reviewer's statement that there are no "anti-Aerian assertions of *episcopal* power, as opposed to the presbyteral" in the Letters of Ignatius. But inasmuch as this does not affect the subject before us, I have passed it by without further notice; for any one who chooses may read the description of the heresy of Aerius, as given by Epiphanius, and compare it with the tenor of the Ignatian Epistles, for himself. But to return to our subject.

The words in the Syriac, ܩܕܡܬ ܕܐܒܥܐ, even when rendered by me into English as literally as I could, "I have been forward to beg," surely need signify nothing more than a forwardness on the writer's mind to express what he was about to say, without waiting for any request or solicitation to do so on the part of those to whom he was writing. And if the Reviewer did not understand the meaning of my translation, nor of the Syriac, he might, if he had chosen to do so, have turned to the original words in the Greek, in that part of my volume in which I had given the Greek text of the three Epistles "as they correspond with the Syriac version."* He would there have seen that they correspond with προέλαβον παρακαλεῖν†, which he has translated, in the page before, "I *have taken* upon me to exhort you;" and, if the translation of the long passage at pp. 316, 317 be his own, "I have forestalled you to exhort you." The exact translation would be, *I have anticipated to exhort you;* and these words can only apply to the following sentence, ὅπως συντρέχητε τῇ γνώμῃ, τοῦ Θεοῦ, and not to any thing whatever which precedes. Moreover, I cannot believe that the Syriac translator, if he were a de-

---

* See p. 172.

† The learned Reviewer would scarcely have advanced such an argument, if he had turned to consult the original Greek.

ceitful epitomizer, designing to favour some heretical purpose, as the Reviewer supposes, would have been so foolish as to leave, in a subsequent part of his work, a direct allusion to what he had been at the pains previously to omit. Further, there is a passage similar to this, and in all probability copied from it, in the Epistle to the Magnesians, which runs thus: "Knowing the well-ordered (state) of your love according to God, rejoicing, I *have* fore-chosen (προειλόμην) in the faith of Jesus Christ, to speak to you."—To use the Reviewer's own words, "We examine the *preceding* part of the Epistle as it stands in the Greek, in quest of any paragraphs in which the writer *has* fore-chosen to speak to them, but *in vain*." It is the first sentence of the Epistle after the salutation.

The author continues in the next place—

> In the same Epistle we read, in the Syriac version, as follows:—"Those things which ye have done in the body, even they are spiritual, because ye have done every thing in Jesus Christ, and ye are prepared for the building of God the Father, and ye are raised on high by the engine of Jesus Christ, which is the cross."—p. 13.—The bold metaphor here used appears to us to be very abruptly introduced; but if we refer to the Greek, we find it softened and qualified, as follows: "Ye are the *stones* of the Temple of the Father, prepared for the building of God, raised to high places by the engine of Jesus Christ, which is the Cross.

In this place most of my readers will perhaps agree with me, that it is a much bolder metaphor, to call men *stones*, than to say that they are prepared for the *building* of God, an expression more than once made use of by St. Paul.* It is true that St. Peter, in employing the same metaphor, makes use of the word *stones*, but only by way of comparison, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house."† But I cannot dismiss this objection of the Reviewer without quoting here the words of a most learned writer, who had taken great pains to investigate the question of the Ignatian Epistles, on this very sentence. "Hear another passage in the "smaller, which presently follows: Βύσαντες τὰ ὦτα, εἰς τὸ μὴ παρα- "δέξασθαι τὰ σπειρόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ὡς ὄντες λίθοι ναοῦ πατρός: *Obstru-* "*entes aures, ad non recipere seminata ab ipsis, ut existentes lapides* "*templi Patris.* This seems an ill-contrived abridgment of a noble

---

* 1 Cor. iii. 9. 2 Cor. v. 1. † 1 Pet. ii. 5.

" context in the Larger; and by introducing men *stopping their ears,* " *that they may not hear what is sowed by hereticks, as being stones* " *of the temple of God,* does so jumble together inconsistent meta- " phors, that one cannot, without great injustice, ascribe it to so " great a man as Ignatius."*

In page 333 the Reviewer continues—

Again, in the same Epistle, we find the words,—" Let us be imitators of our Lord in gentleness, and† who rather may be injured and unjustly used and defrauded: *not that the promise* is the deed, unless that in the power of faith a man may be found faithful even to the end."—These words as they here stand seem to us very enigmatical. *What promise* is that of which he speaks? Consult the Greek, and all which is here obscure becomes clear, and what is abrupt becomes smooth.—" Let us endeavour to be imitators of our Lord. Who can be injured, who be defrauded, who can be set at naught more than He was?"—Then follow three short chapters in the same strain, and in a fourth the author goes on to say,—" No one who *professes* faith is guilty of sin; no one hates who possesses charity. The tree is manifest from its fruit, so they who profess to be Christians shall be proved by their *deeds:* for the work lies not in the *profession,* but in the power of faith, if they be found stedfast unto the end."

It does not belong to the object which I have before me to criticise the Reviewer's version of these passages. If the English literal translation from the Syriac appear " enigmatical," why did he not here also turn to consult the Greek text as I have printed it " as it corresponds with the Syriac"? And why did he make no observation upon the following note on this passage at p. 91 of my volume: " There is nothing in the Syriac to correspond with *νῦν* of the " shorter edition of the Greek, which seems to have been intro- " duced from a miscomprehension of the sense of the passage, " rendered obscure by the long interpolation preceding. The " sense in the Syriac is very plain.—' But let us be imitators of our " ' Lord in meekness, and in our readiness to undergo injuries and " ' suffering; for the profession of faith is nothing unless we con- " ' tinue stedfast in the practice of it to the end.'—The preceding " passages, however, *Οὐδεὶς πίστιν ἐπαγγελλόμενος ἁμαρτάνει — οἱ*

* See Whiston's Dissertation upon the Epistles of Ignatius in Primitive Christianity, p. 24.

† The Reviewer again has omitted here the word " that," and also added the word " faithful."

" ἐπαγγελλόμενοι Χριστιανοὶ εἶναι, δι' ὧν πράσσουσιν ὀφθήσονται,
" express this meaning, and seem to be nothing more than a para-
" phrase of the words Οὐ γὰρ ἐπαγγελίας τὸ ἔργον, ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει
" πίστεως. See a similar passage in the Epistle to the Romans,
p. 18." Why did the Reviewer omit to observe that, at the beginning of this passage in the Greek, Bishop Pearson had noted *Locus est corruptus**, and Dr. Smith, at the end of it, *Locus sane perplexus*? † These two learned men did not find, by "consulting the Greek, that all which is here obscure becomes clear, and what is abrupt becomes smooth." And why has the learned Reviewer, in giving his own version of this passage, omitted to take any account of the little particle νῦν of the Greek, and *nunc* of the Latin?

I have perhaps said enough already to shew that the Reviewer's attempts to point out "omissions" and "gaps, or rough places," in these Epistles, as they are represented in the Syriac, have not been very successful. To my own mind, I confess this internal argument carries with it almost equal force to the united weight of the many external proofs, to which I have been forced to yield conviction. I request every candid and unprejudiced person to read the Epistles as they stand, now that the interpolated passages have been removed from the Greek, and then to read them as they formerly stood, and to judge for himself. I request him to examine the purified Greek, which the Reviewer himself acknowledges to be "Ignatian, and (a few words excepted) nothing but Ignatian‡," and to judge whether that, and the parts omitted as interpolations, could have been by the same hand and the same heart. The Epistle to St. Polycarp, it will be seen, has suffered no other interpolation than the addition of two chapters at the end; its original style, therefore, remains unaltered: and this Epistle varies but slightly in both the Longer and Shorter recensions. That to the Romans, also, is almost free from insertions in the first five chapters, although it has received many additions towards the end: the difference in this Epistle also, in the two recensions, is com-

---

* See Smith's edition, p. 38.

† Ibid. p. 74.

‡ See Review, p. 339.

paratively slight, amounting to only three short insertions in the whole of the three first chapters, one of two words, another of three, and a third of five*; so that its original style, likewise, is not altogether obscured.† But the Epistle to the Ephesians has received so much addition and admixture as to be almost entirely changed from its primitive form. The difference in the style of the Epistle to Polycarp from that of the rest weighed with Archbishop Usher‡ in rejecting it as spurious, as it had also done in part with Vedelius§ and Scultetus‖ before him. And it is also a circumstance worthy of observation, that the sagacity of Vedelius¶ has marked out, as different from the rest, that part of the Epistle to the Trallians which forms the fourth and fifth chapters in the usual Greek editions. These two chapters, in all probability, are the only genuine words of St. Ignatius in this Epistle, and the Syriac version shews that they have been transferred thither, without further change or admixture, from their true position in the Epistle to the Romans.** Whiston, Mosheim,†† and Schroeck‡‡, have likewise made observations upon the difference of style in the Epistle to Polycarp.

I now leave my readers, who have had the patience and kindness to follow me through this detail, to form their own judgment whether the Reviewer be correct in the conclusion at which he arrives in the next page, 334.

> On the whole, then, we find ourselves brought by the force of evidence, both external and internal, to the conclusion, that the Syriac version contained in the volume before us is an imperfect and mutilated representation of the three Epistles of Ignatius.

Thus far I have considered the Reviewer's statements at some length, in the hope of being able thereby to bring forward some facts relating to the Epistles of St. Ignatius, which may be useful

---

* See Usher's edit. p. 82.

† "The other is from such parts as are common both to the larger and smaller editions, especially the Epistles to the Romans and to Polycarp, which, as we shall note hereafter, are almost the same in both." Whiston's Disser. p. 20.

‡ See Usher's Disser. p. ix.

§ See Vedelius' edition, pp. 208 and 209.

‖ See Medulla Patrum, lib. ii. cap. 3.

¶ See edition of Vedelius, p. 6

** See my Preface, p. 29.

†† See Appendix, p. 18.

‡‡ Ibid. p. 19.

to those who may not have the means of making the investigation for themselves, even after the temporary object of this Reply has been accomplished. In the sequel I shall be more brief, as I have only to combat the learned Reviewer's "conjectures."

Having proceeded to this point, he endeavours to account for "the *time* at which, and the *reasons* for which, such a Syriac epitome of Ignatius, if it be an epitome, was made." With respect to the time, "he is induced to conjecture that it is not earlier than the close of the sixth century." Now, unless he can bring forward something more valid as an argument than a "conjecture" to contradict and disprove the passage which I am about to quote from my Preface, relative to the MS. in which a copy of one of these Epistles is found, it would be useless in me to waste my own and my readers' time in confuting this "conjecture." This one Epistle may be considered as a fair specimen of the text of the Syriac version at the age when it was transcribed; and it will be seen, from the collation which I have made with the other copy containing the three Epistles, written apparently about a century later, that they both perfectly agree, with the exception of two or three very slight variations, the interchange of two prepositions of the same signification, and a little difference of orthography in some words, just sufficient to shew that they have not both been transcribed from the same copy. The reason why only one Epistle exists in this manuscript is probably to be found in the fact of its having been written upon the last leaf of the book, and there not being sufficient space for the addition even of one of the others. The vellum of this one leaf, however, was too valuable to be left vacant. The transcriber seems, therefore, to have added to the rest of the contents of the volume the short Letter to Polycarp, which stands the first of those three which form the Syriac collection of the Epistles of St. Ignatius. I transcribe here, from my Preface, p. x., the passage alluded to relative to the age of this manuscript: "There is no date to this volume, but the other, "bound up with it, has a date at the end, which has been partly "erased. Enough, however, remains to shew that it was tran- "scribed between the year of the Greeks 840 and 850, which will "give the date of the MS. between A.D. 530 and 540. The "other volume, bound up with it, was undoubtedly written at the

" same period, and indeed the hand-writing seems to be identical. " We may therefore safely conclude, that this copy of the Epistle " of St. Ignatius to St. Polycarp was transcribed in the first half of " the sixth century, or before A. D. 550."

There is another " conjecture," also, made by the Reviewer, which I cannot pass by without observation.

> We feel little doubt in our own minds that the collection of Syriac MSS., recently deposited in the British Museum, will turn out to be *a nest of Eutychianism.*—p. 386.

This is a bold conjecture to be hazarded by one who must have been almost entirely ignorant of the nature of the contents of the collection to which it refers. And had the learned proposer of it, to use his own words, " waited to take counsel of his calmer judgment*," he would perhaps scarcely have ventured to propound it. In the beginning of his article, as I have already observed, he has stated that he understood that " about 250 volumes, some of them of very great antiquity," which in the same page he calls " valuable MS. materials," " were now safely lodged in our National Museum." In my book I have made use of thirteen of these MSS. Two of them contain copies of the works attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite, a third is the Ecclesiastical history of Eusebius, a fourth is a Catena on the Scriptures, and two others contain the Epistles of St. Ignatius, together with various ascetic works by Pachomius and Evagrius, the Monks of the Desert in Egypt, some of the writings of St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nazianzum, of Mar Jacob†, &c. &c., and the Prophecy of Isaiah. Thus, six at least, out of the thirteen, are free from what the Reviewer designates *Eutychianism*. Of the rest, three contain works by Severus of Antioch, one, writings of Timotheus of Alexandria, and also works of St. Cyril of Alexandria, of Gregory of Neocæsarea and Epiphanius, and three are imperfect fragments, one consisting only of ten leaves, of controversial works by Monophysites, but who in all probability were not Eutychians. These amount in all, perfect and imperfect, to seven volumes.

---

* See Reviewer, p. 348.

† Who this Mar Jacob was will be seen below, at p. 80.

Thus the Reviewer, with the contents of only thirteen MSS. partially made known to him, to six of which he attaches no suspicion—having, also, but a very vague and indistinct notion of the nature of the remaining seven—ventures to assert that he felt "little doubt in his own mind," that the very collection, which in the beginning of his paper he had stated he understood "consisted of about *two hundred and fifty* volumes," "of very great antiquity," and "valuable MS. materials," will turn out to be a *nest of Eutychianism*. Yet this very collection* the Pope Clement XI. sent into Egypt twice, at an interval of ten years, to endeavour to obtain. A part of it was first procured and brought into England by the Archdeacon of Bedford. These volumes were examined, and a list of their contents made, by the Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, who also discovered among them, and published, the Theophania of Eusebius, long supposed to have been lost. Their value was such as to make the Trustees of the National Library, the Archbishop of Canterbury himself at the head, desirous to secure for this country the remainder of these MSS.; and the Lords of Her Majesty's Treasury deemed the object worthy of an especial grant for this purpose. It would not, therefore, perhaps have been too much to expect that the Reviewer, in his confessed ignorance of the nature and contents of about 240 of these volumes, even according to his own calculation, might have been induced to pay more deference to the judgment and character of the parties above specified, than to hazard an opinion that they would have been at so much pains to procure for the British nation, at the expense of a public grant from the Treasury, a mere *nest of Eutychianism*.†

The Reviewer writes, in "offering his own opinion respecting the *authorship* of the Syriac version of the three Epistles of St. Ignatius," in the following terms:— p. 336.

We have shewn above that this version was not known in the metropolis of Syria or of Egypt at the *commencement* of the sixth century; and we do not believe that it was then in existence; but about the middle of that century, the

* The reader will find a short account of this collection in No. CLIII. p. 39, of the Quarterly Review.

† See above, page 7.

Eutychians, after a temporary depression, became dominant in Syria, and over a great part of the East; and have so continued to be till this day, under their two patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch. We know also that they were unscrupulous in mutilating the writings of the early Christian Fathers, to accommodate them to their own heretical dogmas—"*id* Monophysitis SOLENNE," says Assemani (ii. 289.); and we are sure that the Eutychians of *Antioch* would have been very desirous of enlisting, if possible, on their side the name of the venerable bishop and martyr of that city, St. Ignatius; and we find this version in the society of various Eutychian works. All these circumstances, taken together, induce us to conjecture that it is from the hand of a Syrian Monophysite, not earlier than the close of the sixth century.

A sufficient answer, I trust, to the first and last sentences of this paragraph will be found in what has been already said. I do not think it worth while, for my present purpose, to test the historical information which the Reviewer offers in the second. But the next statement I proceed to examine. I confess, for my own part, when I read the passage, I supposed that Assemani had declared that the Monophysites were in the habit of *mutilating* the works of the fathers; that is, of exhibiting them, as the Reviewer has just concluded the Syriac version to be, "an imperfect and mutilated representation" of them, or, as he expresses it three lines below, an "epitome" of them. I turned, however, to Assemani's own words, and I give them here as I find them: "Quod verò Bar-Hebræus errorem suum auctoritate Gregorii Thaumaturgi, &c. confirmare nititur; *depravatis* Patrum codicibus usus est, quemadmodum ab initio exortæ hujus hæreseos animadverterunt Catholici apud Evagrium, lib. 3. His. Eccl. c. 31. *Multos Apollinaris libros* (inquiunt monachi Palæstinæ in epistola ad Alcisonem de Xenaja et sectatoribus Monophysitis) *Athanasio, et Gregorio Thaumaturgo et Julio falsò adscripserunt: quibus præcipuè libris multitudinem in erroris sui societatem inducunt.* Id Monophysitis et aliis hæreticis schismaticis Orientalibus solenne fuisse, observarunt Orthodoxi in Actis Conciliorum ac præsertim in sexta Synodo et in Florentina."*

Assemani in this place accuses the Monophysites and others of corrupting the Fathers, but he has never said they *mutilated* or epitomized them. Further, I think it right to observe, that Asse-

* See Assemani, Vol ii. p. 289.

mani was both a Maronite and a Romanist, and, consequently, doubly an enemy to the poor Jacobites, who still struggled to maintain their independence against the aggressions of Rome. The writer of an article in No. CLIII. p. 49, of the Quarterly Review, has alluded to some suspicious circumstances relative to Assemani; nor would it be difficult to allege others, if necessary: even the very sentence which I have just cited, if duly tested, will perhaps be found to assert more than facts will justify. At any rate, we know that all parties have been in the habit of casting in the teeth of their adversaries the charge of falsification or misinterpretation, when passages or works of the ancient fathers were brought forward which opposed their own views. And this of itself is a proof how numerous such falsifications must have been.

It is worthy of remark in this place, that the same Timotheus of Alexandria, from whose works I have cited the passages attributed to St. Ignatius, brings a similar accusation against his adversaries very soon after the council of Chalcedon. And as this appears in a private Letter to Faustinus, a deacon of his own persuasion, in all probability the charge is not without foundation. I give his own words—:

"Inasmuch as I have heard, since I am in banishment for

Christ's sake, of their terrible blasphemies, which I do not even dare to commit to writing, I exhort your love, that ye will be diligent, according to your ability, to save those who are enticed. If, therefore, any simple-minded persons come to you, and confess the holy faith of the Trinity equal in substance, and desire to be in communion with you; such as confess that our Lord is of the same nature as we are, in the flesh; those who are such as these, do not, I entreat, trouble them at all with other words, nor require from them such subtleties as these, but leave such to praise God and bless the Lord in the simplicity and innocence of their hearts. For it was not against such as these that the holy Fathers decreed anathemas, but against those who esteem themselves to be something; those who are without doctrine, and unstable; those who pervert the sacred Scriptures and the words of the holy Fathers, and explain them otherwise, to their own destruction, and that of such as are persuaded by them: these are they against whom the holy fathers decreed anathemas." *

Moreover, the Eutychians were accused by Vigilius of Thapsus, so early as the fifth century, of corrupting even the Scriptures; a circumstance of which the learned Reviewer does not seem to have been aware, or it would probably have been pressed into his service. But Beausobre and L'Enfant, who have considered this accusation in their "Introduction to the Reading of the Holy Scriptures," disprove it; and as their words are so applicable to the case of the Reviewer, I give them here: "This alteration they "made, as the Bishop pretends, with a design to countenance "their notion, that Jesus Christ did not really *suffer* and die, but "only appeared to others to do so. But nothing can be more "groundless than this charge. We do not learn that *Eutyches* "ever maintained that Jesus Christ did not really die. This "was only a consequence drawn from his doctrine, wherein he "confounded the two natures of Christ. Besides, supposing that "he had been an assertor of the opinion of the *Docetæ*, this "change was likely to do more harm than good to his cause, "since the original *Greek* word, which he rendered *to be reckoned*, "signifies also *to be ranked amongst*. He must therefore have

* See Cod. Add. 12,156. f. 35.

" made the like alteration in St. Luke, where the same words are " read, which yet we do not find he did. But what puts the " matter out of all doubt is, that this *various reading* is of a " more ancient date than the *Eutychians*, since it occurs in a " writer of the third century. It must, then, be a various reading, " which was put into the copies by mistake, and not out of any ill " design. We have insisted upon this point, that we might give " the reader to understand how indiscreet a zeal it is to charge the " hereticks with having falsified the *holy Scriptures*, since such a " charge tends to destroy the authentickness of that sacred book; " and besides, it may be retorted against the orthodox Chris- " tians." *

If the reader be willing to take the trouble, he will find much information relative to the corruptions of the fathers, and even of the Scriptures themselves—not less by the orthodox than heretics—in the third and fourth chapters of the " Treatise on the right use of the Fathers," by Daillé. There is, however, one remarkable passage cited from the learned Masius, which, as it bears a direct reference to the question of Syriac writers, I will transcribe here in the words of the English translator. " This learned person, " observing that the Liturgy of St. Basil was not so long in the " Syriac as in the Greek, assigns this reason:—' For, saith he, men " have always been of such a humour and disposition in matters of " religion, that you shall scarcely find any that have been able to " content themselves with the ceremonies prescribed unto them by " their fathers, however holy they have been in themselves; so " that we may observe that, in course of time, according as the " Prelates have thought fittest to unite the affections of the people " to piety and devotion, many other things have been either added " or altered, and (which is much worse) many superstitious things " have been introduced; in which particular I conceive the Chris- " tians of Syria have been more moderate than the Greeks and " Latins, from not having the opportunity of enjoying the quiet " and abundance of life which the others had." †

The next argument in the paragraph above quoted, which in-

* See Bp. Watson's collection of Theological Tracts, Vol. iii. p. 286.

† See ch. 4. edit. London, 1843. p. 48.

duces the Reviewer "to conjecture" that the Syriac version "is from the hand of a Syrian Monophysite," is, that "we find this version in the society of various Eutychian works." In examining this argument, I will for the moment consider, with the Reviewer, the terms Eutychian and Monophysite as identical. The collection of MSS., brought from the Desert of Nitria, consists of upwards of 360 volumes; and since many of these are made up of three or four different MSS., or parts of MSS. bound together, the whole number of originally distinct volumes may be taken at about 1000. On the last leaf of one of these MSS., the rest of the contents of which are the works of writers of unimpeached orthodoxy, I found one Epistle, and in the middle of another volume, with writers equally orthodox, I discovered the three Epistles of St. Ignatius. The great mass of the collection consists of the holy Scriptures, Liturgies, Lectionaries, and the works of the most orthodox and best of the fathers of the Church, such as Eusebius, Athanasius, the three Gregories, Basil, Ephraem, Chrysostom, Proclus, Cyril of Alexandria, Palladius, Evagrius, Macarius, Jerome, &c. This Syriac version, therefore, could scarcely be found in better "society." There are also in this collection copies of some of the works of Severus, one work of Timotheus, and some of original Syriac writers, who held the Monophysite tenets. In examining all these volumes through, to cull from them every word which I could discover attributed to St. Ignatius, except the passages in Eusebius and Dionysius the Areopagite, already known in the Greek, I could meet with nothing Ignatian in any other writers than Monophysites, and in these is found invariably a text which the Reviewer says "corresponds with the received text." If the society, therefore, in which it is found be any proof of its authorship, we have much greater reason to be "induced to conjecture" that the "received text" is from "the hand of a Monophysite."

In page 336 the Reviewer proceeds—

> Let us now be allowed to advance a step further. For argument's sake, let us be permitted to consider the received text as *proved* to be genuine (which we believe it to be), and let us carefully compare the Syriac version with it; and let us examine whether the passages of the Greek, which are not found in the Syriac, are such as, from the peculiar statements of *doctrine* and *discipline* which they contain, are likely to have been omitted by a Monophysite. The Eutychians were condemned by the Council of Chalcedon, &c.

In this place the Reviewer finds himself in a dilemma. The Syriac version as it stands, even as he himself seems to admit, contains no indication either of any Eutychian or Monophysite tendency; while all the passages which I have given, as quoted by Monophysites, are evidently taken from a recension similar to the Medicean text, although not perfectly agreeing with it, as I have shewn above. This is awkward for the Reviewer's position, because, so far as we have the means of forming any judgment on the matter, the Monophysites used a very different recension of these Epistles from that which he thinks "proves to be a miserable epitome, made by an Eutychian heretic*: or, as he otherwise expresses it, "of Jacobite extraction," or, "from the hand of a Monophysite." Unless, therefore, he take the meaning of the words to be identical, which it by no means appears that they are, it must, according to his shewing, have been the joint production of an Eutychian, a Monophysite, and a Jacobite.

At page 343 the Reviewer seems to be struck with the obvious absurdity of his position, in which he has been endeavouring to shew that the Syriac version is an epitome, made by an Eutychian, because it omits certain passages which he supposes to be *opposed* to Eutychian tenets, while the real facts prove that these very passages are cited by Eutychians† in favour of those tenets. The following is his own way of getting over this difficulty:

> How, then, (it may be asked) could these passages have been *omitted* by an Eutychian, as contrary to his tenets, when they are actually *quoted* by an Eutychian Bishop? The reply to this question is not difficult. It is one of the properties of *truth* to be always consistent; and of *error* to be ever varying: and the inconsistencies of error are always found to corroborate truth. Such is found to be the case here.—p. 343.

I make no remark upon this explanation. In his endeavour to shew that this Syriac version is the work of an Eutychian, a Monophysite, or a Jacobite, the Reviewer volunteers information to his readers relative to the various sects into which the Oriental Churches were divided subsequently to the council of Chalcedon. With this I have nothing to do, and therefore pass it over without

---

* P. 348.

† I use this word in the Reviewer's sense of it, and not as I understand it myself.

further observation. Neither is it any business of mine to undertake the defence of Severus of Antioch, or Timotheus of Alexandria, whom the Reviewer designates as "leaders of a large body of Eutychian heretics." But I can hardly understand how a man, who anathematized Eutyches and refuted his tenets, as Timotheus did, can be called an Eutychian.* Indeed, one division of the very work of this author, from which I have given the extracts in my volume, is entitled, ܟܬܒܐ ܕܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ ܥܠ ܐܘܛܝܟܝ "Proofs against the Eutychians†;" and the Reviewer himself undertakes "to shew that *Severus*, though an Eutychian, waged war against Eutychians."‡ This is not quite consistent with the character of an able and politic Bishop, which even his adversaries seem to accord to him. I would further remark, that the learned Reviewer can scarcely be ignorant that almost the only accounts which we have hitherto had of these Patriarchs, and of those who were under their spiritual jurisdiction, have been furnished by their opponents and their bitterest enemies, but that they were held in the highest estimation by their own people, who had the best means of judging of their character.§ Surely, therefore, when about to accuse in such stringent terms, he should‖ "have found it needful to admonish himself of the justice of hearing *both sides*, and have called to mind the sage advice of the cautious Epicharmus" —Νᾶφε καὶ μεμνασ' ἀπιστεῖν· ἄρθρα ταῦτα τῶν φρενῶν.¶

---

* See L'Art de Vér. les dates, Vol. i. p. 236. Fleury, lib. 29. c. 48. Evagrius Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 6.

† See Add. MSS. 12,156. fol. 32. rect.

‡ It was my intention to add in this place the creeds or formularies of faith both of Severus and Timotheus, in order to give my readers an opportunity of judging from their own words how near these two Patriarchs approached to, or how far they receded from, the true Catholic faith. But I do not think it necessary to my present purpose, and consequently reserve them for a collection of creeds, gathered from writers of the Oriental Churches, which I hope at some future period to find leisure to arrange and publish.

§ The Reviewer himself has alluded to this in note 3. p. 329.

‖ See Review, p. 322.

¶ The learned Reviewer seems to have taken these words of Epicharmus from the same volume as the passage relative to epitomes, at p. 329; at least this is the form in which they are given by Polybius: edition by Casaubon, fol. Paris, 1609. p. 768. d. In Stobæus' Florilegium, edition of Grotius, p. 25,

For my own part, so far as I have had the opportunity of investigating this subject, I feel that we are indebted to these two Patriarchs for resisting the aggressions of their fellow-patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople, who, had they found them more ready to submit, and to give up their rights and independency, would never perhaps have discovered their heresy, or at least would have overlooked it.

The Reviewer speaks with much complacency of the council of Chalcedon, which he styles the "greatest *council* that had ever been convoked in the Christian Church." But while we acknowledge the correctness of their definition of faith, we cannot but bewail the disgraceful riots of their proceedings, unbecoming to Christians, and still much more so to a Synod of Christian Bishops; nor can we fail to lament the most unhappy consequences of that council, which rent Christendom to pieces, and made it an easy victory in the East to Mohammedanism in the following century. Truly, of this council it may be said, as the excellent Gregory Nazianzen has written in his Letter to Procopius*: Ἔχω μὲν οὕτως, εἰ δεῖ τ' ἀληθὲς γράφειν, ὥστε πάντα σύλλογον φεύγειν ἐπισκόπων, ὅτι μηδεμιᾶς συνόδου τέλος εἶδον χρηστὸν· μηδὲ λύσιν κακῶν μᾶλλον ἐσχηκυίας, ἢ προσθήκην· αἱ γὰρ φιλονεικίαι καὶ φιλαρχίαι λόγου κρείττονες.

I will not waste my readers' time in examining all the passages by which the Reviewer endeavours to add strength to his argument. Two or three will perhaps suffice.

At page 339 he writes—

One of the few *additions* in the Syriac version occurs at the close of the Epistle to Polycarp—"I salute him who is about to be thought worthy" (thought worthy by *whom* does not appear from the *Syriac*, but it is clear from the Greek that it is by the *council*, to be convoked by Polycarp; and this is another instance in which it is necessary to appeal to the *Greek*, to give completeness to the Syriac)—"to go into Syria in my stead, as I charged thee"—

---

this passage is given, Νῆφε καὶ μέμνησ' ἀπιστεῖν, νεῦρα ταῦτα τῶν φρενῶν. In Gaisford's edition we find μέμνησ' for μεμνασ': Vol. i. p. 420. Riccardi, in his notes on Proclus Constant. p. 265, cites this verse, Νᾶφε καὶ μέμνασ' ἀπιστεῖν, ἄρθρα, νεῦρα τῶν φρενῶν, which comes the nearest to Q. Cicero's version; *Nervos atque artus esse sapientiæ, non temere credere.* De Petit. Consul. Ch. x.

* See Gregorii Naz. Opera, edit. Parisiis, 1609. Vol. i. p. 814.

(for what purpose he is to go into Syria is not intelligible from the Syriac, but it is clear from the Greek). The words, "in my stead, as I charged thee," are not found in the Greek. Our conjecture is, that they were interpolated in extenuation of the schismatical acts of the Eutychians, who obtruded their Bishops in the place of orthodox ones (as they did Severus, in the room of Flavian), in contravention of the well-known rule of Nicæa, that no *second* Bishop should ever be created in a city where there was one already.

On the subject of the first part of this paragraph I have already spoken in the Preface to my volume, pp. xxvii. and xxviii., to which I beg to refer. I think the reader will hardly fail to draw the same conclusion as I have done, that it was much more natural for St. Ignatius, in writing to St. Polycarp, whom he had so lately seen, to make such an allusion as is conveyed in these words, respecting the person who was to go to Antioch in his stead, than to write express directions as to the manner in which St. Polycarp was to proceed, such as are given in the seventh and eighth chapters of this Epistle in the Greek, and which in themselves seem more consonant with the practice of later times. The words, "in my stead," certainly do not exist in the Greek in this place, but they are, as the Reviewer himself observes, found in the "spurious Epistle to the Antiochians," whither, in all probability, they have been transferred from their true position in the Syriac by the fabricator of that Epistle, in the same manner as the latter part of the Epistle to the Romans has been transferred to that to the Trallians, and as numerous other passages from the genuine Epistles are borrowed, to give plausibility to those which are false.

The author's "conjecture" relative to these words in the Syriac version I leave to my readers' own judgment, and pass on to lay before them one or two other "conjectures."

At page 340 the Reviewer writes—

We must advert here to a slight alteration in the Syriac version of this Epistle to the Ephesians. Ignatius says in the Greek, "When there is no *strife* among you, ye live the life of God." This is plain enough; but our Syriac translator having, perhaps, before his eyes the *strifes* of the twelve different factions of Eutychians, to say nothing of their feuds with the orthodox, chooses to read ἔρως, *love*, for ἔρις, *strife*; and at the price of a false concord, and taking *love* in a vicious sense, to warn them against *it*, instead of against *strife!*

We have here another specimen of the learned Reviewer's style of verbal criticism. My translation is, "one of those *lusts;*" and

both the English, as well as its corresponding Syriac word, expresses other desires than those of "*love* in a vicious sense." How, then, could he possibly tell that the translator, who, according to his own theory, must have performed his task more than twelve centuries ago, chose to read ἔρως for ἔρις, and also to take it in a vicious sense? I think, however, I can prove that it is very unlikely that he did read ἔρως, and also, that I shall be able to shew what in all probability he did read. The word ἔρως occurs once, and only once, in the Greek of the Ignatian Epistles, in the well-known words, ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται*; and as this is a genuine passage, it is also found in the Syriac version, where it is rendered by ⟨ܚܘܒܝ †, as it also is in the same passage cited in the Syriac translation of the supposed works of Dionysius the Areopagite.‡ The Syriac word in the Epistle to the Ephesians, now under our consideration, is ⟨ܚܘܒ§; and this occurs also in the Epistle to Polycarp, in the passage, *that they may not be found the slaves of lusts,* ⟨ܚܘܒ‖; and again, a little further on, from the same root, although not quite in the same form, *that the marriage might be in our Lord, and not in lust,* ⟨ܚܒ.¶ It is found likewise in the Martyrdom of St. Ignatius, *in the desire* ⟨ܚܘ *of the sufferings of the cross.*** In all of these three places the corresponding Greek word is ἐπιθυμία. We have every reason, therefore, to suppose that the Syriac translator must have read the same word in the fourth place: and so, indeed, we find that he did, upon referring to the Longer recension, which in this, as in many other instances, has preserved the true reading: ὅταν γὰρ μηδεμία ἐπιθυμία ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχει, κ.τ.λ.†† Will the Reviewer urge, in this case, that the interpolator of the Longer recension, "having perhaps before his eyes the *strifes* of the twelve different factions of Eutychians, to say nothing of their feuds with the orthodox, chooses to read ἐπιθυμία, *lust,* for ἔρις, *strife,*" &c.?

At page 348 the Reviewer writes—

It is a remarkable fact, that all the *Jacobite* Patriarchs of Syria at this day

---

* Epist. to Romans, ch. vi. edit. Jacobson, p. 364.

† P. 22. l. 5. ‡ P. 54. l. 8. § P. 12. l. 10.

‖ P. 6. l. 11. ¶ P. 6. l. 22. ** P. 66. l. 16.

†† See Archbp. Usher's edition, p. 33.

usurp the title of *Ignatius!* They thus shew their desire to *appropriate* the holy Martyr to themselves; and the same spirit would have not spared his *works* which has taken this liberty with his *name.*

According to the authority of Le Quien, the first Jacobite Patriarch who bore the name of Ignatius was raised to that office* A. D. 877, or about two hundred years, according to the Reviewer's own calculation, after the Syriac version was made. The next who took this appellation was elevated to the Patriarchate about three hundred and forty-five years later†, A.D. 1222.

If there be any value in the Reviewer's argument with respect to Jacobite Patriarchs of Syria, let us apply it to the Popes of Rome. "It is a remarkable fact, that no less than thirteen Popes of Rome have usurped the title of Clement. They thus shew their desire to *appropriate* that apostolic Father to themselves; and the same spirit would not have spared his *works* which has taken this liberty with his *name.*"

The Reviewer then proceeds—

Our conjecture, that this Syriac version is of Jacobite extraction, is further confirmed by the fact, that in the very *same* MS. volume which contains it, are found sermons by *Mar Jacob*, whom we conjecture to be no other than the celebrated heretical and schismatical Bishop of Edessa

To this he adds the following note:—

If this *Mar Jacob* should turn out to be the *other* Bishop of Edessa (see above, p. 347, note), he *also* was a *Monophysite*‡; if we may judge from his translation of the writings of *Severus*, and from his ritual works, received by the *Jacobites.*

And at page 349, more boldly—

And there is a strong presumptive evidence against the orthodoxy and integrity of writings discovered, as the two MSS. of the Syriac version have been, in the suspicious company of Severus of Antioch, and Timotheus of Alexandria, and other Monophysite writers, and one of these MSS., the only *one* which contains the *three* Epistles, bound up in the same volume with a work of a leader, perhaps the head of the Jacobites.

The few words in which these three sentences are comprised, contain so many errors, that it would occupy far too much time to notice

---

* See Oriens Christianus, Vol. ii. p. 1375. † See ibid. p 1392.

‡ Assemani says he was an orthodox Catholic, although he did translate the works of Severus. See Bibl. Orient. Vol. i. p. 470. The Liturgies of St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, &c., are also "received by the *Jacobites:*" shall we, therefore, suspect these Fathers of Monophysite doctrines?

them all: this I think will hardly be deemed necessary. I therefore limit myself to the examination of the one which is made principally to bear upon the matter at present under our consideration.

In giving the short account in my Preface of the MSS. from which I had extracted my materials, after speaking of the three Epistles of St. Ignatius found in the volume alluded to, I merely added—"The rest of this MS. is miscellaneous, containing a Letter "of Gregory Theologus to Evagrius, Sermons of Mar Jacob, &c. &c."* I did not stop to inquire who this Mar Jacob was, because some research would be necessary to enable me to ascertain that fact; and I did not for an instant imagine it could be supposed to affect the question relating to the Syriac version, any more than I could conceive that Epiphanius and Gregory Thaumaturgus would incur the charge of Monophysitism because they are found in the same volume as Timotheus of Alexandria, or that Bp. Tomline would run the risk of being suspected of Calvinism because I might happen to find a copy of his *Elements of Christian Theology* bound up together with the *Institutes* of the famous Reformer, of Geneva. I felt sure, however, that it could scarcely be Mar Jacob Baradæus who has given name to the Jacobites, because I had transcribed his life, written by a contemporary Bishop, and had no recollection of any mention whatever of writings by him.† I thought it was very unlikely to be by Mar Jacob the Interpreter, because he was not consecrated Bishop before 651‡, and, consequently, did not till then bear the title of Mar; and I was by no means certain that the MS. might not have been transcribed before that date; besides, although Assemani has given a long list of his works, he mentions no sermons. I should, therefore, have drawn the conclusion, that the author under our consideration was no "Bishop of Edessa" at all, but a man far more celebrated for his piety and learning than either, the famous Mar Jacob of Sarug, Bishop of Batnæ; and such proves to be the fact. This will be evident to any one who will compare the beginning of this homily, which is metrical, ܚܙܬܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܬܘܒܐ ܡܠܝܐ ܠܕܚܙܐ ܒܗ, with the commencement of that described by Assemani in his first

* See my Preface, p. 12.

† Concerning the one or two works, which have been falsely attributed to him, see Assemani Bibl. Or. Vol. ii. p. 67.

‡ See ibid. Vol. i. p. 468.

volume of his Bibliotheca Orientalis, p. 316. No. 79. This Mar Jacob was born A.D. 452*, and died A.D. 521, or many years earlier than either of the other Bishops with whom the Reviewer could fain confound him. But lest the unfavourable light, in which the Reviewer seems to regard the other Bishops who bore this name, should also be reflected upon the author of the sermons found in the same MS. with the three Epistles of St. Ignatius, I transcribe Assemani's account of him:—"Jacobus Sarugensis, cognomento *Doctor*, Batnarum in Mesopotamia Episcopus, eam cùm doctrinæ, tùm sanctitatis opinionem apud Syros obtinuit, ut ipsum tàm Orthodoxi, quàm Hæretici velut Sanctum venerentur."†

At page 345 the Reviewer, after bringing several heavy charges against Severus, to which, as they are not drawn from my volume, I am not bound to reply, writes in the following words:—

It will be further seen, that Severus has actually distorted one of these passages to suit his own particular dogma. "Christ (says the Greek) was baptized, that *by suffering* He might purify water." "Christ (says Severus) was baptized, that *being passible* He might purify water."

I think, before the Reviewer had ventured to bring such an accusation against a Christian Patriarch, he should have been at the pains fully to examine the idioms of the two languages, to ascertain whether both these expressions made use of might not mean precisely the same thing. I cannot, however, even if they do not, disprove the Reviewer's statement that Severus "has actually distorted this passage to suit his own dogma," because I have not read all his writings; but so far as I know, Severus has never used these words at all; they are, however, cited by Timotheus of Alexandria, as I have given them at page 54 of my volume, where, in all probability, the Reviewer became acquainted with them.

The Reviewer adduces several sentences, concerning which he says it "is sufficiently obvious why an Eutychian should have rejected such passages," and endeavours thence to strengthen his supposition, that the Syriac version is a "miserable epitome made by an Eutychian heretic." With respect to these I observe generally, that so far as I am able to form an opinion, they have nothing

* See Assemani's Bibl. Orient. Vol. i. pp. 289, 290.

† Ibid. p. 283.

whatever to do with Eutychian tenets; and further, the epitomizer must have spent his labour in vain, since he has allowed others to remain which inculcate the very same doctrine. Timotheus and Severus*, both able and learned men (and, according to the authority of the Reviewer, Eutychians), would hardly have cited these in favour of Eutychian opinions, if others thought it prudent to reject them as opposed to Eutychianism. I will, however, examine one or two of the passages which the Reviewer brings forward—

> We have just quoted one passage from the Greek respecting the Eucharist, which is wholly omitted from the Syriac: let us now say a few words concerning another passage relative to the same subject. In the seventh chapter of his Epistles to the Romans, according to the *Greek* text, Ignatius exclaims: "I long for the Bread of God, *the heavenly bread, the bread of life*, which is the Flesh of *Jesus* Christ, *the Son of God, made in the last times of the seed of David and of Abraham;* and I long for the Drink *of God* which is His Blood, which is incorruptible love, and *everlasting life.*" Those words which are printed in *italics* are *not* found in the *Syriac* version.

In the first place, I remark that Dr. Smith commences a long note on this passage with the following words: "Ἄρτον Θεοῦ Θέλω, κ.τ.λ. Multa hic, quæ occurrunt quoque apud Metaphrastam, et reperiuntur etiam in vulgatis codicibus, manifestam sapiunt interpolationem." † In the next place, I observe that the Latin version edited by Archbp. Usher has made almost the same omissions, as the following words shew:—"Panem Dei volo, quod est caro Jesu Christi, ejus qui ex genere David, et potum volo sanguinem ipsius, quod est charitas incorruptibilis." ‡

It must therefore be no less "remarkable" (to use the Reviewer's own words in his observations on this passage), that the Latin translator, as well as "the Syriac translator, while he has preserved the expression "*the bread of God,*" by which the elements seem to be divinized, has omitted the very term, "*bread of life,*" which is urged by Orthodoxus against the Eutychian."—p. 342.

---

* At page 345 the Reviewer makes the following remark:—"The Eutychianism, therefore, of the Translator appears in some respects to have *differed* from that of Severus. On the whole, therefore, it appears to us much more fortunate than wonderful, that Severus should have cited some passages which are omitted in the Syriac version."

† See Smith's edition, notes, p. 101.

‡ See Jacobson's edit. p. 367.

Again, at p. 345—

On the other hand, the Syriac translator has *omitted* the close of the following sentence in the Epistle to the Ephesians (cap. i.):—"I hope to obtain by your prayers to fight with beasts at Rome, that thus I may be able to be a disciple of *God, who offered himself an oblation and sacrifice for us.*" The words after *God* do not appear in the *Syriac.*

So likewise they "do not appear" in the Latin version edited by Archbp. Usher as we have seen above.* If, therefore, these omissions have been made in the Syriac version by the translator, to favour Eutychian tenets, for what purpose must we conclude that they have been made by the Latin translator? Will the learned Reviewer now take upon himself to shew that this version also is a "miserable work by an Eutychian heretic?"

At page 346, the Reviewer writes—

We have already adverted to a passage in which the Syriac translator has suppressed the word *Jesus.* He seems to have taken great pains to do so; especially when Jesus stands before Christ, and when a distinction is made between His person and that of the Father.

I will only add one passage more, and then close my remarks.

Such is the result of a comparison of the Syriac with the Greek, as far as respects one great particular *doctrine* of Christianity, and we look *in vain* for *any evidence* that the Syriac translator would have accepted the following articles of the Creed:—"I believe in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried."

There is no blindness so dark as that of those who wilfully close their eyes against the light. Let us, therefore, take the Syriac version as we find it. In the second line of the first Epistle, that to Polycarp, we read, *by God the Father, and by Jesus Christ our Lord.* In the same Epistle we find, *Him who for our sakes suffered; Him who for our sakes endured every thing in every form.* In that to the Ephesians we read, *the greatness of God the Father —the will of the Father of Jesus Christ our God—the love of Jesus Christ the Saviour—ye are raised on high by the engine of Jesus Christ, which is the cross, and ye are drawn by the rope, which is the Holy Ghost——. There was hidden from the ruler of this world the virginity of Mary, and the birth of our Lord.*

---

* See page 24.

Surely here is evidence enough, taken from two of the Epistles only, in the author's own words, of his acceptance of the belief in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ our Lord, born of the Virgin Mary, who suffered and was crucified, and implied evidence also of his belief in the miraculous conception by the Holy Ghost, as well as of our Lord's death and consequent burial. Nothing, certainly, is said about Pontius Pilate. Neither is his name mentioned by St. James, St. Peter, St. John, and St. Jude, in their Epistles; nor, indeed, do they speak of our Lord's miraculous conception by the Holy Ghost, or of his burial. Must we therefore conclude that "we look *in vain* for *any evidence* that these holy Apostles would have accepted these articles of the Apostles' Creed?"

I trust that I have now said enough to vindicate the Epistles of St. Ignatius, as they are represented to us in the Syriac version, from the charge of heresy amounting almost to infidelity, which has been brought against them by the Reviewer.

It seems plain, from the Reviewer's concluding remarks, that his anxiety to uphold and defend the integrity of the seven Ignatian Epistles is closely connected with some apprehension that the rejection of those passages, which the Syriac version points out as spurious, may be detrimental to the cause of that system of Church government which he is desirous of seeing strengthened by the "increase of the Episcopate." No one can be more desirous than myself that every thing should be done which wisdom and prudence can suggest, to augment the efficacy of that system, and its consequent benefits to our Christian community. But in considering a subject like that which we have before us, it becomes our duty to divest ourselves as much as possible of the bias of our prejudices and our sympathies, in order that we may be the better able to discover the truth, and then to follow it simply for its own sake, whether it confirm or condemn our previous notions and inclinations.

I take, however, a very different view of this matter, and entertain no such apprehension. I have already stated my conviction, that were every word of the Ignatian Epistles proved to be false, nor had one syllable of the writings of that holy man been preserved to us, this would not in the slightest degree affect the cause of Episcopacy, which is built upon surer ground than to be so easily

shaken. The establishment of that system in Christ's Church, to be of authority, must be looked for many years before St. Ignatius was led to suffer at Rome. Are we, therefore, to suppose that the basis upon which it is raised would have been weakened if he had written no letters on his journey? Indeed, the circumstances under which he was carried away, and the known character and behaviour of those who had the charge of him, render it at first sight improbable that he should have written many long letters on the way, or that one of his main objects in every one of them should have been the exaltation of the clergy, and especially of that order to which he himself belonged. This of itself has been felt to be a very weighty objection against the Ignatian Epistles; and when added to so many other grounds for believing them to be spurious, it has rendered their authority altogether void and unavailing in all controversies with those who objected to the Episcopal form of Church government. Indeed, that system seems to have suffered in estimation from the indiscreet zeal of some of its advocates in insisting so much upon the Ignatian Epistles. In this instance, as in almost all other similar cases, when their opponents found the arguments, derived from this source, too weak to be maintained, they were ready to push their advantage further, and to conclude that the rest, which had not been made so prominent, were still more feeble and unavailing.

None of the objections, however, from the reasons just stated, can with justice be brought against the Epistles of St. Ignatius as they are found in the Syriac Version. He only refers to that subject in one of his Epistles, and his reason for so doing is sufficiently obvious. It is well known that many heresies were then springing up; and the people at that early period could only be taught the true faith, and kept therein, by the diligent attention of their bishops and pastors. St. Ignatius, who had recently parted from St. Polycarp, and probably was writing to him at his own request, could not have adopted a surer and safer plan to preserve the Smyrneans from falling into error, than by exhorting them to give all heed to their Bishop, who had drawn the waters of life and truth so near to their only source. That this was the chief object of St. Ignatius is plain from the letter itself, which it is evident he intended to be read publicly to the Church at

Smyrna. He reminds St. Polycarp of his duty to maintain his position as a Christian Bishop, and to stand firmly: to love both the good and evil disciples, bringing the latter into subjection by gentleness and meekness. He exhorts him to stand up like a brave combatant against those who teach strange doctrines, and bids him to impress several important duties upon his flock; and then, addressing himself to the people, he urges them to look to their Bishop for instruction and example, adding, that he was ready to offer his life for those who were obedient to the Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons. Nothing can be more admirable than this letter in this respect. St. Ignatius seems to have felt that the Smyrneans would then be ready to give much heed to his words, as one so shortly about to suffer for Christ's sake; and he therefore took the opportunity of confirming them in their faith and duty, by teaching them through their own appointed teachers, and thus endeavouring to bind them together in the close ties of affection and obedience, which would be the most certain way of preventing them from sinning or from falling into error.

Thus we obtain not only the testimony of St. Ignatius to the Episcopal form of government and the three distinct orders of the clergy, as established in still earlier times, existing in the Church of Smyrna at the beginning of the second century; but also a certain insight into the separate and relative duties of the people and the clergy.

We do not, however, find this holy man saying, that *the Bishop sits in the place of God, and the Presbyters in the place of the Apostles.**—*He who honoreth the Bishop, is honored of God, he who doeth any thing without the knowledge of the Bishop, serveth the Devil*†; and using other expressions similar to these, such as we could hardly expect, after being acquainted with the Apostolic Epistles, from one who had both seen and heard the Beloved Disciple. Neither, indeed, do we find these express words, *Let no one do any thing of what pertains to the Church without the Bishop.*‡ But in writing to a Christian Bishop an epistle evidently intended to be read to his flock, Ignatius does say what is tantamount to this:

---

* Ep to Magnes c. VI. edit. Jacobson, p. 306.

† See Ep. to Smyrn. c. IX ibid. p. 416. ‡ Ibid. c. VIII. p. 414.

Let nothing be done without thy will, to which he adds, *Neither do thou any thing without the will of God*, a caution no less salutary for Bishops than that which precedes it is for those who are entrusted to their charge. Had all Bishops in all ages, and under all circumstances, duly heeded these words of St. Ignatius, the Apostolic institution and spiritual authority of their sacred office probably would never have been questioned.

In closing these observations, I cannot refrain from expressing my hope, that some one who has more learning and ability, and also is happy in having more leisure than myself, will reconsider the whole of this most interesting question, relative to the Ignatian Epistles. The object is well worthy of the labour; and it formerly engaged the attention of some of the ablest and best Prelates of our Church. The point at issue is either to strip off, as Archbp. Usher expresses it, *a number of beggarly patches added unto his purple by later hands, by which it is foully depraved**, or to commit little less than sacrilege, by rending the Episcopal mantle of this holy Martyr. From that which has been said above it is plain what are my own convictions on this matter. I shall, however, be sorry if any one interested in this subject should rest contented with any arguments which I have adduced, without duly testing and examining them to ascertain if they be well founded. Whosoever may undertake the investigation, it is due no less to himself than to others that he should endeavour to divest himself of every bias of prejudice or feeling; that he should seek impartially, and state candidly, the evidence and the arguments on both sides; and if, from greater knowledge of the subject, more extensive research, or any more certain process of reasoning, he can prove my conclusions to be ill-founded, not only shall I be ready most willingly to acknowledge them to be so, but I also shall be among the first to offer him my sincere thanks for more clearly pointing out to me the TRUTH.

---

* See above, p. 11.

APPENDIX.

OPINIONS OF VARIOUS LEARNED MEN RESPECTING THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES, FROM THE YEAR 1650 DOWN TO THE DISCOVERY OF THE SYRIAC VERSION IN 1843.

1650.

PETAU (D.), *De Theologicis Dogmatibus;—De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia.*

1. SED unum ex antiquissimis adeoque primi, et Apostolici sæculi Patribus nefas est prætermittere, sanctissimum Ignatium: cujus creberrimis, ac luculentissimis testimoniis catholica de Ecclesiasticorum ordinum discrimine traditio mirum in modum adstruitur. Quæ res Leidensem primum professorem Salmasium, tum hujus suffragatorem Blondellum offendit sic, ut ad elevandam immo pessundandam Apostolici viri auctoritatem, studium omne suum, et conatum uterque contulerit: atque eo demum progressi sunt, ut ab Ignatio ullas unquam esse scriptas epistolas negare non sunt veriti: quæ mihi opinio prorsus absurda, et intoleranda videri solet. Equidem haud abnuerim epistolas illius varie interpolatas et quibusdam additis mutatas, ac depravatas fuisse: tum aliquas esse supposititias: verum nullas omnino ab Ignatio Epistolas esse scriptas, id vero nimium temere affirmari sentio. Editæ sunt ante annos quatuor ex Bibliotheca Florentina Ignatii epistolæ sex hoc ordine: 1. ad Smyrnæos; 2. ad Polycarpum; 3. ad Ephesios; 4. ad Magnesios; 5. ad Philadelphenses; 6. ad Trallianos: deerat ad Romanos septima. Totidem enim, et quidem istas percenset Hieronymus in libro de Scriptoribus, capite 26. Eæ porro multum a vulgatis hactenus discrepant: atque hoc habent præcipuum, et magni utique faciendum, quod omnes in illis reperiantur sententiæ, quæ ab antiquis Patribus ex Epistolis Ignatii citatæ leguntur: quæ quidem in aliis desiderantur editionibus. Debemus hoc præstantissimum Christianæ antiquitatis monumentum eruditissimo viro Isaaco Vossio Gerardi filio, qui illas e Florentino codice descriptas trans Alpes retulit; mihique legendas humanissime obtulit: ac non multo post Lugduni Batavorum Græcè et Latinè publicavit, addita, quam annis ante aliquot ediderat Jacobus Usserius, Latina veteri versione, apprimè consentiente cum Græcis Florentini codicis: ut *hæc prudens, ac justa suspicio* sit, illas esse genuinas Ignatii epistolas; quas antiquorum consensus illustribus testimoniis commendatas ac approbatas reliquit.—*Lib.* 5. *Cap.* 8. *Edit. Antverp.* tom. iv. p. 161.

1681.

Owen (John), *On enquiry into the original nature, institution, power, order, and communion of Evangelical Churches.* London, 1681. 4to.

Unto this time—that is, about the year 107 or 108—do belong the epistles ascribed unto Ignatius, if so be they were written by him. For Polycarpus wrote his Epistle to the Philippians after Ignatius was carried to Rome, having wrote his epistles before in Asia. Many are the contests of learned men about those epistles which remain, whether they are genuine, or the same that were written by him: for that he did write epistles unto sundry churches is acknowledged by all. And whereas there have in this age been two copies found and published of those epistles, wherein very many things that were obnoxious unto just exception in those before published do not at all appear, yet men are not agreed which of them ought to be preferred; and many yet deny that any of them were those written by Ignatius. I shall not interpose in this contest; only I must say, that if any of his genuine writings do yet remain, yet the corruption and interpolation of them for many ages must needs much impair the authority of what is represented in them as his; nor am I delivered from these thoughts by the late, either more sound or more maimed, editions of them; and the truth is, the corruption and fiction of epistolical writings in the first ages was so intolerable, as that very little in that kind is preserved sincere and unquestionable.—*Works, edited by Russel*, 1826. vol. xx. p. 147.

1689.

Spanheim (Frid.), *Summa Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ.* Lugd. Bat. 1689. 12mo.

Non verò tacendus *Ignatius* Episcopus vel Præpositus Ecclesiæ Antiochenæ, Apostolorum discipulus et auditor, martyr sanctissimus, Trajani anno x. Æræ vulg. cviii. Hunc in Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis habent Veteres omnes, post *Eusebium*, ne dicam Irenæum, et Originem citantes Ignatiana. Sanè ejus Epistolæ *septem*, in vinculis scriptæ, præ reliquis, à pluribus approbantur, ad *Smyrnæos*, ad *Polycarpum*, ad *Ephesios*, ad *Magnesios*, ad *Philadelphenses*, ad *Trallianos*, et ad *Romanos*, ut ab Isaaco Vossio Græcè, ab Usserio Armachano Latinè, vulgatæ fuerunt, omnium purgatissimæ. Reliquæ, sub Ignatii nomine, seu Latinæ seu Græcæ, tacitæ Eusebio et Hieronymo, omnium consensione in suppositiis habentur. Sed nec leves sunt Salmasii, Blondelli, Dallæi, Laroquii, dubitandi de prioribus rationes. Quum sint in iis plurima, quæ Ignatio posteriora videantur, phraseologiæ, facta, hæreses, ritus, disciplinæ ratio.—P. 88.

1692.

Schelstrate (Eman.), *Antiquitas Ecclesiæ dissertationibus monimentis ac notis illustrata.* 1692. 2 Vol. fol.

Nec obstat his omnibus, quòd Ignatius teste Eusebio, cum è portu Smyr-

nensi solvisset, Troademque venisset, privatim ad Polycarpum Smyrnensium episcopum litteras dederit, et in iis juxta editionem laudatam scripserit. *Decet Polycarpe Deo beatissime concilium congregare Deo decentissimum, et ordinare aliquem, quem dilectum valde habetis, et impigrum, qui poterit Dei Cursor vocari, et hunc dignificari, ut vadens in Syriam glorificet vestram impigram charitatem in gloriam Dei.* Quamvis enim in Græco legatur Χειροτονῆσαι *ordinare;* hæc tamen nequaquam de manus impositione Episcopi Antiocheni intelligi possunt, sed tantùm de alicujus viri electione, qui munus Cursoris impleret, ut Antiochiam pergeret, et litteras, aliaque perferret. Unde Polycarpus ipse in sua ad Philadelphienses epistola testatur: "Scripsistis ad me et vos, et Ignatius, ut si quis fortè in Syriam proficisceretur, vestras litteras eò deferret. Quod quidem perficiam, si tempus opportunum nactus fuero, vel ego ipse, vel per alium quempiam, cui id munus vestra causa delegabo." Hæc Polycarpus ad Philadelphienses apud Eusebium libro 3. cap. 36. Ex quibus patet, Ignatium litteras misisse ad Antiochenos, idque per Philadelphienses, quas litteras Polycarpus vel per se, vel per alium quempiam se missurum promisit. Non agebatur itaque de ordinando per B. Polycarpum Antiocheno Episcopo, sed eligendo viro egregio. Χειροτονέω itaque significat ibi *per suffragia eligere:* electus autem ille Antiochiam mittendus erat, ut epistolas Ignatii ad illius civitatis ecclesiam perferret, et Antiochensem in virtute et fide confirmaret. Unde Divus Hieronymus libro de Scriptoribus agens de B. Ignatii ad Polycarpum epistola: *Scripsit propriè ad Polycarpum,* inquit, *commendans illi Antiochensem Ecclesiam.* Et ante D. Hieronymum Eusebius libro 3. cap. 36. *Ignatius a Smyrna ulterius progressus, cum Troadem venisset, inde ad Philadelphienses litteras dedit, et ad Smyrnæorum Ecclesiam, privatimque ad Polycarpum eorum episcopum, quem cum Apostolicum virum esse planè cognosceret, ipsi, tanquam bonus ac fidelis Pastor, gregem Antiochenæ Ecclesiæ commendavit; rogans ut omni cura ac diligentia illum fovere vellet.* Ignatius se absente Ecclesiam Antiochenorum Polycarpo commendavit, de ordinando in sui locum Episcopo nihil scripsit, nihil locutus fuit: sed nec scribere, nec loqui potuit, cùm Ignatio vivente alium Episcopum constituere non licuerit. Unde et ipse Ignatius epistola ad Antiochenos: *Presbyteri pascite gregem, qui inter vos est, donec Deus designaverit eum, qui principatum in vobis habiturus est: ego enim jam immolor, ut Christum lucrifaciam.* Ex quibus patet, Presbyteros Antiochenos absente Episcopo gregem istius Ecclesiæ pascere debuisse, neque ad Polycarpum curam spectasse, nisi in quantum Ignatii litteris ei delegatum erat, ut Ecclesiam Antiochensem consilio suo, et adhortationibus juvaret, non vero eis Episcopum ordinaret, utpote qui post Ignatii martyrium Antiochiæ electus, et creatus est, ut testatur Eusebius libro 3. cap. 35: *Eo,* nimirum Ignatio, *defuncto, Episcopatum Antiochenæ Ecclesiæ Heros suscepit.*—Tom. ii. p. 249.

1692.

Tentzel (Wil. Ernest), *Exercitationes Selectæ.* Lips. 1692. 4to.

IX. Posthæc dispiciendum est, quæ Nostratium Doctorum fuerit sententia,

notato prius discrimine inter eos, qui ante et post Usserii Vossiique editiones scripserunt. Ad priorem classem spectant Centuriatores Magd. Epistolas Ignatii omnes pro suspectis dubiisque habentes: quos more suo secutus est Lucas Osiander Centur. I. p. 131. B. Chemnitius in Orat. de lect. PP. judicavit, *multa admixta esse, quæ non sunt Ignatii.* Joh. Pappus Epit. Histor. Eccles. p. 102. *Epistolam ad Smyrnenses vel suppositiam vel certe corruptam esse* censet. Simile judicium post B. Gerhardum Patrol. pp. 58, 59 est B. Dorschei Mysar. Missæ c. vii. p. 249. *Ignatianas Epistolas adulteratas antiquitus fuisse et suppositia multa continere.* In posteriori ordine primum locum obtinet Theologorum nostræ ætatis Principes, B. Hulsemannus Patrolog. pp. 975, 976, et D. Abr. Calovius, Patronus et Doctor maximus, in Methodo studii Theol. p. 300, et in Consid. Arminianismi p. 126. quos sequuntur Theologi ac Philologi plurimi, quorum illustria nomina breve chartæ spatium non capit. Censura eorum in hoc constitit, ut non omnem quidem prioribus septem Ignatianis γνησιότητα derogent, ab omni tamen interpolatione aut mutilatione haud esse immunes dicant. Nec aliter poterit judicare, quicunque accuratius ponderaverit tot causas gravissimas, quæ summos viros ad hanc sententiam ferendam impulerunt: quas utut magno studio tollere conatus sit Pearsonius, non omnibus tamen ex æquo ipsum satisfecisse eruditi animadverterunt. Præterea ratio emendandi Græcum textum juxta Latinam versionem, quam inivit Usserius, non adeo tuta, tantove negotio congrua videtur, cum versio illa recentior sit, quippe circa confinia sexti septimive sæculi, conjectante ipso Usserio, confecta: nec tanta fide et cura Græcum exprimat textum, quanta in his monumentis requiritur, ut idem et Pearsonius passim observant: denique quod maximum est, editionem Ignatianarum non genuinam, sed interpolatam spuriisque Epistolis auctam sequatur. Quare etiam Usserius Prolegom. c. iv. *ex ea versione sola integritati suæ restitui posse Ignatium polliceri non audet, nisi alterius exemplaris subsidium accesserit; vel Græci, cujus ex Bibliotheca Florentina obtinendi spes sibi nuper injecta sit non exigua: vel saltem Syriaci, quod Romæ reperiri adhuc posse non desperet.* Enimvero, quum quadraginta ferme annis ab Usserii editione elapsis nemo, quod sciam, Romæ adservatum Codicem Syriacum memoraverit, nec probare queat institutum, quo ex versione Syra textus Græcus emendandus foret: videndum est, quæ Codicis Medicei, quem tantopere præstolatur Usserius, et in sua editione expressit Vossius, auctoritas pondusque sit, et num *veras et genuinas et testimoniis antiquorum ubique congruentes exhibeat* epistolas, quemadmodum videtur illustri Vossio. At vero, si accuratius inspiciatur, ab omnibus plane interpolationibus ac mutilationibus liber immunisque haud esse deprehendetur. Neque enim ubique ipsi convenit cum veterum Patrum, Theodoreti imprimis, allegatis, fatente in Notis plus semel Vossio, quod sane maximum affert præjudicium. Si enim in illis, quæ a veteribus citantur, fides MSti vacillat, quis asseverabit, majorem in reliquis ipsi tribuendam esse auctoritatem? Neque tamen dissimulo, magis cum veterum allegatis convenire Codicem Florentinum, quam Augustanum a Paceo editum. Hinc dum in Dissertatione de disciplina arcani adversus Schelstratium disputans negavi, locum ex Ignatii Epistola ad

Smyrnæos a Theodoreto in tertio Dialogo recitatum inveniri in modernis codicibus sequutus sum tum Doctorum nostrorum, tum ipsius adversarii adserta, antiquioribus procul dubio editionibus innixa; sed in Vossiana eum postea deprehendi: quod Petavius etiam monuit lib. xii. de Incarnatione cap. xiii. num. 3. neutiquam tamen dissimulans, pro voce προσευχὰς Theodoretum *in suo exemplari habuisse* προσφορὰς, indeque concludens: *Quare Eucharistia est* προσφορὰ, *id est oblatio, et sacrificium Corporis Christi, quod in cruce pependit, ex antiquissimi Græcorum Patrum Ignatii sincero liquidoque testimonio.* Unde duo concludimus apprime notanda. Alterum est, Theodoretum ex codice suo verba Ignatii descripsisse, ejusque lectionem Codici Mediceo præferendam esse. Alterum, hunc ab antiquis distare. Utrumque confirmari potest ex duobus locis, quæ idem Theodoretus ex epistola Ignatii ad Ephesios citavit. Priorem etiam Athanasius et Gelasius allegarunt, discrepantque omnes a libro Florentino, ut patet parallelismo apud Usserium cap. iii. Prolegomenorum p. 17, qui differentiam quidem illam non dissimulat, sed parvi admodum momenti censet. At cum Athanasius et reliqui duo *ex Codicibus, qui ad manum erant, descripserint* verba Ignatii, fatente Usserio, judicent prudentiores, quanta inter Ignatianos codices jamtum quarto quintove sæculo fuerit varietas. Stephanus le Moyne, tom. ii. Var. Sacr. p. 160. contendit, Theodoreti ætate epistolas Ignatii puras et sinceras extitisse; mox tamen producto Athanasio, et hunc et Theodoretum non ex codice Ignatii locum descripsisse, sed ex memoria statuit; quod nodum secare est, non solvere. Præcipua codicum differentia in eo consistit, quod in Mediceo, et apud Athanasium legitur γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγεννήτος apud Theodoretum vero γεννητὸς ἐξ ἀγεννήτου. Hanc animadvertens Petavius, lib. iii. de Incarnatione cap. vi. num. 8. *suspicatur, ab aliquo commutatum olim istum esse locum; qui cum animadverteret* ἀγεννήτου *vocabulum proprie attribui Patri, et in eo personalem Ejus proprietatem ab antiquis collocari, veritus sit, ne Sabelliani et Patripassiani unam Patris et Filii personam inde colligerent: ideoque rescripserit filium esse* γεννητὸν *ex* ἀγεννήτῳ *Patre.* Mirum vero est, quod asserit Petavius, in codice Florentino, cujus apographum a Vossio acceperit, ita legi, ut apud Theodoretum, quum ipse tamen Vossius ediderit, ut apud Athanasium habetur. Nec minus notabilis est differentia, quæ inter Theodoretum et librum Mediceum occurrit in posteriori loco epistolæ ad Ephesios. Theodoretus quippe citat: ἵνα τὸ θνητὸς ἡμῶν καθαρισθῇ, observante Usserio Prolegom. cap. iv. p. 19: eandemque lectionem in Catena Græca in Lucam habet Macarius Chryscocephalus, quinti decimi sæculi scriptor, quem idem citat Usserius cap. xiix. p. 135. *et antiqua hujus epistolæ editione usum* aperte fatetur. Qui ergo factum est, ut Codex Mediceus et Interpres Usserianus aliter legant: ἵνα τῷ πάθει τὸ ὕδωρ καθάρισῃ, *ut passione aquam purificet?* Cum autem genuinos procul dubio codices consuluerint Theodoretus et Macarius, tum Mediceum interpolatum esse manifeste consequitur.

X. Sunt etiam verba quædam ab antiquis Ignatio tributa, quæ in editione Vossiana frustra quæras. Cujusmodi sunt, quæ Hieronymus lib. iii. adversus Pelagianos *Ignatium audaciter scribere* refert. Pearsonius quidem P. I. cap. iii. existimat, Hieronymum memoria lapsum pro Barnaba Ignatium posuisse, idem-

que ante eum censuit Hugo Menardus in Notis ad epistolam Barnabæ. Sed quidni eadem scripserit Ignatius, quæ vel ex eo hauserit postea supposititius Barnabas, vel ex sua sententia pariter edixerit? Præterea clarius exemplum defectus in Codice Mediceo ostendit Io. Baptista Cotelerius, tom. i. Monumentorum Ecclesiæ, cui inter alia inseruit Joannis Antiocheni Orationem in donationes Monasteriorum Laicis factas, ubi num. xii. hæc ex Ignatio proferuntur: τῷ δὲ ἐκκλησίαν Θεοῦ σκανδαλίσαντι οὐδὲ μαρτυρίου αἷμα, κατὰ τὸν θεοφόρον Ἰγνάτιον, ἀρκεῖ εἰς συνχώρησιν —*Ei autem, qui Ecclesiam Dei offenderit, neque martyrii sanguis juxta Theophorum Ignatium, ad veniam sufficit.* Vixit Joannes ille Antiochenus circa medium sæculi xii. quippe a Leone Isauro et Constantino Copronymo, ipsoque adeo bello Iconomachico, ad sua usque tempora quadringentos numerat annos. De loco vero Ignatii ab eo producto Cotelerii in Notis hæc est ἐπίκρισις: *Nihil tale legitur in Epistolis S. Ignatii. Sed a Chrysostomo Homil.* II. *in Epistolam ad Ephesios, ubi contra schisma disserit, similia proferuntur, tanquam viri cujusdam Sancti, cujus nomen non apponitur.* Ἀνὴρ δέ τις ἅγιος, *inquit beatus Doctor,* εἶπέ τι δοκοῦν εἶναι τολμηρὸν, πλὴν ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐφθέγξετο. τί δὲ τοῦτό ἐστιν; Οὐδὲ μαρτυρίου αἷμα ταύτην δύνασθαι ἐξαλείφειν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν—*Dixit autem vir quidem sanctus quiddam, quod magnam præ se fert audaciam; sed tamen est elocutus. Quid hoc est autem? Dixit, ne sanguinem quidem martyrii posse delere hoc peccatum.* At enim quis dubitaverit, Ignatium a Chrysostomo intelligi? Quis nescit veterum Ecclesiæ Doctorum morem, nomina Scriptorum, si quos allegant, nonnunquam subticentium? quemadmodum Irenæus et Origines Ignatii apopthegmata proferentes nomen ejus non addunt. Causam si quæras, cur hoc loco Chrysostomus idem fecerit, cogita, num conveniens fuerit, audaciæ coram universo populo illum virum insimulare, quem alibi peculiari sermone summis adfecerat laudibus.

XI. Notandum porro Codicem Florentinum in cæteris a corruptionibus liberum haud esse, adeo ut Vossius in Notis nunc *verba quædam librarii culpa* in epistola ad Smyrnæos *excidisse* putarit: nunc *locum ex omnibus Ignatianis corruptissimum* in ea ad Trallianos deprehenderit: nunc conquestus sit, *tam inveterata in his Epistolis esse vulnera, ut tempus quo illa inflicta sint, propius Ignatii quam nostrum accedat sæculum.* Similiter Usserius in præfat. Appendicis Ignat. *conqueritur, non reperisse se Mediceum codicem, qualem nobis Turrianus commendaverat, emendatissimum.* Idem fatetur Hammondus Dissert. II. cap. ii. et Pearsonius Prolegom. cap. vi. Quapropter Hammondus etiam coactus fuit ad alias Orbis Bibliothecas provocare, in quibus tamen puriorem Codicem adversari hactenus nemo retulit. Ex quibus omnibus consequitur, genuinas Ignatii Epistolas hodie non superesse, sed variis modis alibi interpolatas, alibi decurtatas in Usserii Vossiique editionibus existere. Et cum Interpreti Latino Anglicano exemplar Græcum Florentinum apprime convenire, Vossius, Usserius, Hammondus ac Pearsonius ultro fateantur: interpres autem interpolatum, et spuriis Epistolis auctum Ignatianarum Codicem expresserit, quis aliter de hodie extantibus epistolis judicare potest? Quare non desunt, qui lectionem interpolati Græci Codicis nonnunquam præferant Mediceo, ut nuper fecit Richardus Simonius adversus ipsum Vossium disputans, de quo ex personati

Hieronymi le Camus Theologi Parisiensis judicio, p. 24. nonnulla attulisse sufficiet: *Jam ad Ignatii locum, qui sumptus fuit ex illius Epistola ad Philadelphienses venio, ex quo posse ostendi tempus, quo primum Ebraici Codices corrumpi cœperint, Vossius existimat. Sed quam fœde etiam in hoc erratum fuerit, demonstraverat Simonius ipsius Ignatii mentem verbis illius claris et apertis explicans. Nunc Vossius Ignatii sensum conatur obscurare. Miratur Simonii supinitatem, qui cum se criticum profiteatur, spurii Ignatii verba adduxerit; affertque Vossius ipsa Ignatii verba, ut concipiuntur in codice Florentino, nec quidquam in illis mutandum esse affirmat. Sed quam feliciter hoc negotium illi succedat, juvat expendere. Simonius Ignatii verba non quidem omnino ut extant in Florentino Codice, qui manifeste hoc loco corruptus est et obscurus, protulit; sed ex interpolato Codice, qui isto loco interpolatus non est, immo simplicior est Florentino, et vetustam lectionem magis referens. Interpolatum enim Epistolarum Ignatii codicem in omnibus interpolatum esse nemo dixerit, ne quidem ipse Vossius. Existimavit igitur Simonius, hic Florentinum Codicem, qui multum præ se fert obscuritatis, corrigendum esse ex alio Codice, qui simplicior est, cujusque verba clara sunt; cum ipse Vossius hoc ipso loco legendum putet ἀρχαίοις, ut habet Codex interpolatus, non vero ἀρχείοις, ut extat ino Codice Florentino. Melior est, inquit Vossius, lectio Pseudo-Ignatii, quam et sequentia videntur approbare. Licuit igitur Simonio sequi Pseudo-Ignatii lectionem, ubi constat illum interpolatum non esse, melioremque sensum, quam Codex Florentinus efficit.* Est et alius in eadem ad Philadelphienses epistola Ignatii locus de conjugio Paulli, quem adhuc hodie ut genuinum laudare solent, ut Ioan. Adamus Osiander Disput. de conjugio Paulli, Cap. iii. num. 12. et 13. Casp. Loescherus de Latrociniis in scriptores publicos num. 65. Eberhard Rudolph. Rothius de Nicolaitis cap. ii. num. 6. Hi aliique similes non codicem Florentinum, sed antea vulgatos sequi debent, cujus generis procul dubio est Noribergensis MStus, in quo Paulli etiam nomen extare audio. Nam in Florentino totius hujus de Apostolorum conjugio periodi nullum occurrit vestigium; unde Pearsonius, p. ii. Vindiciarum cap. x. Dallæi hanc in rem disputata tribus verbis perstringit: *Capite* xx. *de solo Paulli conjugio agit, et Interpolatorem ferit.* Quare etiam Fridericus Spanhemius in Quaternione Dissertationum, p. 71. testimonium illud pro Ignatiano haud agnoscit. His præiverat Franciscus Turrianus Libro i. pro Canonibus Apostolorum cap ii. *Ignatius,* inquiens, *in vetere interpretatione Latina manuscripta epistolæ ad Philadelph. quæ in Vaticano est, non habet, quod in Græca epistola nuper in publicum emissa* (Pacæi editionem intelligit) *legitur de Paullo inter eos, qui uxorem habuerunt.* Huc sine dubio respexit Colomesius initio Paralipomenorum ad Cavii Chartophylacem, pag. 2. *Antiquam Ignatii epistolarum versionem Latinam ex Bibliotheca Vaticana laudat Fr. Turrianus, (ob infinitam ejus lectionem sæpius a nobis advocandus) in Defensione Canonum Apostolicorum, circa initium. De hac versione ne γρὺ quidem Ignatii Epistolarum editores.* Meretur sane hæc Latina versio, ut diligentius inquiratur et cum impressis conferatur: quod fortasse illustris Ciampinus in Collatione Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ a se instituta proponet, orbique litterario aperiet. Mihi enim videtur eadem esse cum Usseriana, quippe quæ etiam caret verbis controversis de Paulli Conjugio.

XII. Ut igitur libere sententiam meam edisseram, sic animum composui, ut nihil pro Ignatiano habeam, nisi quod a Patribus priorum quatuor post martyrium Ignatii sæculorum sanctissimo viro tribuitur: a qua opinione non adeo absunt Centuriatores Magdeburgenses. Qui autem sequentibus vixerunt ætatibus, ut Antiochus Monachus, Joannes Damascenus, &c., non habuerunt amplius germanas purasque Ignatii Epistolas, sed varie interpolatas et novis et spuriis auctas, prout ostendit Usserius: eatenus tamen tanquam verorum Ignatii verborum testes admitti possunt, quatenus cum antiquoribus illis aliquo modo consentiunt. Atque huc collimaturos spero omnes, qui epistolas Ignatii interpolatas esse hodie agnoscunt. Quo enim alioquin fundamento pro Ignatianis venditabuntur, quæ pro talibus, stante hoc judicio, haberi neutiquam possunt? Quo artificio secernentur *τὰ κίβδηλα καὶ τὰ δόκιμα*? quibus characteribus internoscere dabitur ea, quæ Ignatius scripsit, a transmutatis et adjectis? Novi non deesse inter eruditos, qui hoc negotium facile confici dicant. Sed dicunt saltem, non probant; nec suo ostendunt exemplo, rei procul dubio difficultate deterriti. Optimus dijudicandi modus consistit in diligenti Manuscriptorum Codicum antiquorum bonæque notæ collatione, quorum ope interpolata et corrupta facile agnosci et ab Auctoris verbis distingui possunt. At in Ignatianis hoc artificium locum non habet. Per universam quippe Europam, quantum constat, non reperitur Codex melior Florentino sive Mediceo. Cujus defectus cum supra monstrati sint, tum, nisi ex Asia aut aliunde novus ac genuinus emergat, de restituendis in integrum Ignatii Epistolis plane desperandum erit. Vidimus hactenus rationes oppido prægnantes *περὶ γνησιότητος* Ignatiarum dubitandi.—P. 58.

1699.

Ittig (L. T.), *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum.* Lips. 1699. 12mo.

Et laudanda quidem Ruinarti industria, qui hanc epistolam ad Romanos, qualem in Colbertino codice invenit, in addendis ad acta Martyrum sincera et selecta publici juris fecit. Num vero plane genuina hæc sit epistola ad Romanos Ignatiana eruditis dispiciendum relinquo et ad Vossii editionem redeo. P. 275.

Etsi autem septem Ignatii epistolas ab Eusebio recensitas genuinas dici posse haud inficier, et pleraque in istis epistolis, quales e Florentino Codice prodierunt, autorem Ignatium spirare existimem, asserere tamen haud ausim, quod Florentinus ille codex omni ex parte genuinus sit, et Ignatii epistolæ per tot sæcula ab omni interpolatione liberæ ad nostram usque ætatem permanserint. P. 287.

1699.

Grabe (J. E.), *Spicilegium SS. Patrum.* Oxoniæ. 1699. 2 vol. 8vo.

Jam septem genuinarum S. Ignatii epistolarum historiam, ordinem quo scriptæ sunt, varias editiones, diversa de eis eruditorum judicia, etc., recenserem, nisi Usserius et Pearsonius aliique eorum ductu ista egregie præstitissent. De

auctore tamen interpolationis genuinarum et suppositionis spuriarum Epistolarum, hujusque occasione aliqua in Notis addam, et sinceritatem insuper Codicis Florentini adversus objectiones Tentzelii defendam: ex quibus simul patebit, alias adhuc a B. Martyre literas exaratas quidem, sed deperditas esse. Ad Antiochenos præcipue eum scripsisse nullus dubito: neque enim proprii gregis oblivisci poterat, qui alias Ecclesias literis cohortabatur, ac in fide confirmabat. Ex genuina igitur ad Antiochenos epistola puto petitas a Damasceno duas sententias, p. 24. recitandas, cum in spuria non extent. Cæterum ad finem præfationis properans, de epistola ad Romanos solum tribus verbis moneo, eam ab Usserio et Vossio in nullo MS. Codice Græcè sinceram inventam, sed ope antiquæ Latinæ versionis ab interpolatione defæcatam fuisse, donec eam antiquis Actis insertam nuper Ruinartus edidit: cujus exemplar hic exhibere, ac ut appareat, quàm parum Usserius in editione sua aberrarit, diversas ejus lectiones ad cujusque paginæ oram annotare volui. Neque tamen dissimulare possum, et istud non omnino sincerum, sed loca Scripturæ, 2 Cor. iv. et Matth. xvi. aliaque aliqua addita videri, quæ a veteri versione absunt.—*Vol.* ii. p. 8.

1701.

Le Nain de Tillemont (Sébastien), *Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire Ecclesiastique.* Paris, 1701. 4to.

Note viii. *Sur diverses lettres attribuées à Saint Ignace.* Nous avons soutenu contre Usserius dans la note 6, la verité de l'epistre que nous avons de S. Ignace à Saint Polycarpe. Mais nous n'avons pas les mesmes raisons pour défendre les autres lettres attribuées à S. Ignace, qu' Usserius a rejettées comme fausses. Daillè accorde aisément qu'il en a écrit plusieurs, outre celles qui sont marquées par Eusebe: et il n'y a aucun moyen de douter qu'il n'ait écrit au moins à son Eglise d'Antioche, sur ce que Dieu avoit appaisé la persecution. On peut mettre dans la mesme classe les trois autres qu' Usserius et Vossius ont trouvées dans les manuscrits avec celles qu'on reconnoist pour indubitables, savoir celle à Marie de Cassoboles, celle à l'Eglise de Tarse, et celle à Heron diacre d'Antioche: et examiner ensuite s'il faut rejetter ces lettres par la seule raison qu' Eusebe ne les a pas connues, parcequ'elles n'estoient point de celles que S. Polycarpe avoit envoyées aux Philippiens. Que si l'on trouve que cette raison ne suffit pas estant seule, il restera à examiner ces lettres en elles mesmes; ce que nous n'avons pas cru devoir entreprendre ici. Nous remarquons seulement que nous ne voyons pas moyen de satisfaire à ce que la lettre à ceux d'Antioche ne leur dit rien sur la paix.—Vol. ii. p. 581.

1706.

Basnage (Sam.), *Annales Politico-Ecclesiastici.* Roter. 1706. 3 Vol. fol.

Quasi verò prora puppisque Religionis penderet ex quæstione critica. In-

dulgentiores sanè nobis erunt Ignatiarum Epistolarum patroni, etsi succenseant viris clarissimis Blondello, Salmasio, Dallæo, Larroquano, qui quas ex Bibliotheca Florentina doctissimus Isaac Vossius edidit Epistolas pro genuinis non habuere. Quorum sententiæ lubenter nos comites addimus, etsi non indiligenter legerimus, quæ vir magni nominis, Joannes Pearson, in Vindiciis Ignatianis scripsit. Totas sanè et eruditionis et ingenii sui vires effudit, ut editæ a Vossio Epistolæ ascriberentur Ignatio. Ex eo fonte hortos irrigarunt suos viri ex Monachorum grege eruditi, Natalis Alexander Dominicanus, et Nicolaus Le Nourri, Ordinis S. Benedicti, qui *invictis rationum monumentis*, germano parenti suo Ignatio Epistolas se restituisse arbitratur. Duplici argumentorum genere utitur Pearson ὁ πανὺ, quæ externa sunt et interna. Externa a testimoniis, interna ab ipsis Epistolis. Testimonia quod attinet, ostendit capite secundo Vindiciarum, quòd *nullum seculum suis testibus careat, à secundo quo primum natæ, ad decimum quintum, quo primum impressæ sunt Epistolæ.* Quæ, si verum volumus, ingens testimoniorum strues, ad eruditionem Vindicis declarandam facere potest, ad probandum non potest. Cùm testimonia Autorum, qui post tertium floruere seculum, prioribus innitantur, nec plus sit in eo suffragio virium, quam in Polycarpi, Irenæi, Originis, Eusebii. Potuisset ergo celeberrimus Vindiciarum autor, et sibi, et lectoribus tanti laboris exhauriendi dare immunitatem. Præterea cum certo certius sit, interpolatas fuisse Ignatii Epistolas, in dubium quoque revocari posset, an non et corruptionis aliquid passæ sint illæ, quas ex Bibliotheca Florentina Vossius suppeditavit, cùm et in ipsis ea reperiantur, quæ non sunt Ignatii Ævi. Nec paucæ illæ laciniæ, quæ etiamnum in Origine extant aut Eusebio, utut sinceræ prædicantur, satis argumento præbent, ut Epistolas corruptionis esse omnis immunes statuam. Quam si tueremur sententiam, desumptum a testibus caderet argumentum. In promptu enim responsio esset, Ignatii quidem Epistolas ad nos pervenisse, sed adulteras, et ab impuris manibus nonnihil contaminatas, quod quomodo refelli posset, nulli videmus. Quòd si magis placet, totas ab Ignatio Epistolas abjudicare, non ideo vincent earum patroni. Primum clariss. Pearsonio testimonium ex Polycarpo petitur. *Epistolas omnes* Ignatii, *quas ad me scripsit, et quascunque demum apud nos reperire potuimus, quemadmodum nobis mandastis, ad vos misimus.* Quæ leguntur in Polycarpo ad Philippenses Epistola. Hinc acutissime colligit Vindex Ignatianus. *An ullo modo verisimile est Epistolas a tanto Martyre exaratas, a tanto editas atque laudatas Epistolæ etiam illi subjectas, quæ per tot sæcula publice lecta earum memoriam perpetuo redintegrabat, statim periisse et ab omnium oculis ereptas fuisse.* Hoc argumenti dilatat Le Nourii Dissertatione Septima, c. iii. p. 151. Iners tamen esse ipsamet experientia testatur. Laodiceâ Epistolam scriptam fuisse, a Colossensibus legendam, Paulus docuit Apostolus. *Et cum perlecta fuerit apud vos Epistola, facite ut etiam in Laodicensium ecclesia recitetur, et scriptam Laodiceâ vos quoque legatis.* Col. iv. 16. Non celebriores erant Ignatii Epistolæ, non illa sanctiores, quæ Laodiceâ scripta est, ornata cœlestis Apostoli testimonio, et in ecclesiis Apostolicis, palam et publice lecta. Periit tamen funditùs, et ab omnium oculis erepta fuit. Non ecclesiarum veneratio, non testimonium Apostolorum, non scrinia Christianorum, im-

pedimento fuere, quominus ex mortalium evanuerit oculis. Quid, nonne ex verbis Polycarpi liquet, non unam ad se ab Ignatio Epistolam scriptam fuisse? Τὰς Ἐπιστολὰς Ἰγνατίου, τὰς πεμφθείσας ἡμῖν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ—*Epistolas omnes Ignatii, quas ad me scripsit.* Ecce plures Epistolas, quæ ab illa quoque distinguuntur, cujus mentionem fecerat paucis supra lineis: *Scripsistis ad me, et vos et Ignatius.* Atqui una tantum superest Ignatii ad Polycarpum Epistola, quæ a viris etiam eruditissimis, Usserio Bonaque, atro carbone notatur. Periit et sancta Philippensium ad Polycarpum Epistola. Ergone licebit, tragico more exclamare: *Numquid omnes Ecclesiæ et Christiani, tantis animis, tantâque arte, in illarum Epistolarum perniciem extinctionemque conspirarunt?* Patribus, qui secundo floruere seculo ignotæ fuerunt Ignatianæ Epistolæ; ignotæ Justino, Theophilo Antiocheno, Irenæo, Clementi Alexandrino, Tertulliano, qui nunquam eas adhibent refellendis Hæreticis, licet Apocryphis libris sæpenumero utantur.—Vol. ii. p. 20.

1710.

Whiston (William), *An Essay upon the Epistles of Ignatius.* London, 1710. 8vo.

I shall shew, by internal characters, that the Smaller Epistles cannot be the genuine ones, nor so early as the days of Ignatius. (1) In the Smaller Epistle to the Ephesians, in all the copies, our Saviour is expressly affirmed to be ἀγέννητος, *ingenitus, unbegotten;* which is so impossible for Ignatius to say, or any of his time, that no one, till the days of Athanasius, ever durst mention a thing so notoriously contrary to the Christian Religion. Nay, if we are willing to suppose all the MSS. mistaken, and make it ἀγένητος, *unmade,* yet will the affirmation be still not much better, ...

. . . .

. . . . And Theodorit (the first author who for certain cited the Smaller edition, or one very like it) read here γεννητὸς ἐξ ἀγεννήτου, according to the sense of the Larger edition; so that his copy was not herein so corrupt as the present smaller edition. Yet is Athanasius supposed to quote this Smaller edition as to these very words. (2) In this Smaller edition our Saviour is expressly stil'd λόγος ἀΐδιος, *the Eternal Word*[1], which epithet was never applied to him by any Christian till the fourth century. And since neither Athanasius himself, nor any others of the orthodox, ever then quoted this text of Ignatius, which yet would have been of greater consequence than all that they said in that controversy, 'tis highly probable that they never saw that Smaller edition of these Epistles in which it is, even in all the three copies. (3) In the same Smaller edition, in the very same place, these words are added, οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών, that he is the *Eternal Word,* not proceeding from σιγή, *Silence,* that famous Valentinian origin of things. The allusion here to the famous σιγή of the Valentinians, or of Marcellus from them, is so

(1) Magnes. c. 8. p. 310. edit. Jacobson.

plain, that the greatest patrons of these Smaller epistles are ashamed directly to deny it, though it be so very strong and almost undeniable an argument against them. For 'tis undoubted, from Irenæus[1], that Valentinus himself was not publickly known as any famous Heretic, nor came from Egypt to Rome till the Pontificate of Hyginus, that is, not till between A.D. 126 and 130, or between ten and fourteen years after the death of Ignatius. Nay, 'tis also plain from Tertullian, an almost cotemporary writer, and very near the place also, that Valentinus was alive, and at Rome in the Pontificate of Eleutherus afterward: that is, between A.D. 170 and 185. So that those who make his σιγὴ famous at Antioch, or in Asia, before A.D. 116, the *latest* year possible for the death of Ignatius, do merely serve an hypothesis; and assert what is highly improbable, if not next to impossible to be true; without, nay against all the Original Testimonies thereto relating. Indeed, the learned are here driven to a great strait, and would fain affirm that some of the other ancienter heretics had introduced the σιγὴ before Valentinus: but still without one single ancient testimony for such an hypothesis. They tell us, indeed, that Eusebius[2] ascribes it to Simon Magus, in these words; κατ' ἀυτὸν ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἀθέων αἱρεσιωτῶν ἀρχηγὸν, ὃς τὰ ἄθεα δογματίζων ἀπεφαίνετο λέγων, ἦν Θεὸς καὶ σιγὴ. Whereas, by this Ringleader of these sorts of Hereticks, Eusebius plainly means Valentinus, and no other; as any one may learn from Epiphanius[3]. And I wonder that anybody should expound him otherwise. So that this Testimony is so far from a confirmation, that 'tis rather a confutation of the foregoing evasion. We shall see anon that this character will best suit the latter days of Marcellus and Athanasius, long afterwards. (4) In the same smaller Epistles we have this passage of some Hereticks then arisen in the Church: Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπερ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν. These Hereticks, it seems, absented from the Christian Assemblies, because they did not own the *Eucharist to be the Flesh of Christ which suffered for them, and was raised again by the good Will of the Father.* This is a strange passage indeed; and so far from the age of Ignatius, when Christians did not permit any Hereticks to communicate with them; and when there are no footsteps of any such Hereticks in the world; that it could hardly be so early as the middle of the fifth century, when yet these Epistles are certainly cited by Theodorit. Perhaps 'tis a still later interpolation, even in the smaller copies; yet it is in all the MSS., both the *Greek* one at *Florence*, and the two *Latin* ones in *England*. These four internal characters of times later than the death of Ignatius, seem to me so strong, that the arguments for the antiquity of the same Epistles ought to be next to demonstrative ere they can be compared to them.—P. 6.

I observe further, that the Abridger, as well as Eusebius, seems never to have seen more than those seven Epistles in Polycarp's collection. And accordingly, those to Tarsus, to Antioch, and to Hero, have suffered no altera-

(1) Advers. Hæres. Book iii. c. 4.
(2) De Eccl. Theolog. Book ii. c. 9.
(3) Epiphan. Hæres. 72. sect. 7.

tions at all. Yet 'tis strange that these Epistles, most plainly and indisputably of the Larger sort, and not less favourable to the Arians than the rest, if no other than Interpolated ones, should alone be preserved, and that by the Orthodox too all along, and their originals utterly lost: Nay, that those originals should themselves never be certainly heard of in all the past writers and histories of the Church. I desire the admirers of the Smaller Edition to give a rational account of the strange case of these three Epistles also: for they appear to be genuine, and exactly of the same nature, stile, genius, doctrine, and time with the rest of the Larger Epistles. Nay, they are in the *Medicean Greek*, and in the two *English Latin* copies, with the Smaller, as well as in all but one of the Larger copies, both *Greek* and *Latin*, that are known among us, as I have already observed. I take notice, that the particular occasion and time of the epitomizing these Epistles may be in some measure guessed at by a passage in Eusebius against Marcellus, which has been in part alledged already, but which must be here set down entirely, in these words: Ὁ δὲ Μάρκελλος ἐτόλμα ὑποτίθεσθαι, πάλαι μὲν λέγων εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ τινα ἡσυχίαν ἅμα τῷ Θεῷ ὑπογράφων ἑαυτῷ, κατ' αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἀθέων αἱρεσιωτῶν ἀρχηγὸν, ὃς, τὰ ἄθεα δογματίζων ἀπεφαίνετο, λέγων, ἦν Θεὸς καὶ σιγή· μετὰ δὴ τὴν σιγὴν καὶ τὴν ἡσυχίαν προελθεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς κοσμοποιΐας δραστικὴ ἐνεργείᾳ. The forementioned text, in the Smaller epistles, ὃς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀΐδιος, οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθὼν, bears so plain an allusion to this Heretical notion of Marcellus from the Valentinians, and seems so plainly inserted to palliate and excuse the same, that 'tis highly probable it was inserted by Marcellus's great friend, Athanasius, who mended his notion, or at least by some of his followers, in the fourth century.—P. 42.

I observe, that we do not find these Smaller Epistles certainly quoted by any but Theodorit and Gelasius till the sixth century of the Church. Tho', indeed, when these extracts were so favourable to orthodoxy; and the original Epistles so Heretical and Arian, 'tis no wonder that the Smaller spurious copies spread into several parts of the Church afterwards, and pass'd with several of those Ignorant Ages for the genuine Epistles themselves. 'Tis rather a wonder, that while but one single copy of the most famous and undoubted Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians is now known in Christendom, so many copies, both Greek and Latin, should be preserved of the Larger and original Epistles of Ignatius; nay, and those more numerous than of the Smaller Abridgments, even at this day. P. 44.

1710.

Acta Eruditorum anno MDCCX.

Quam variæ prostent Epistolarum *Ignatii* editiones, quantæque de eis ortæ sint inter eruditos controversiæ, alienum est ab hoc loco recensere. Factum hoc jam est a celeb. nostro quondam Ittigio in dissertatione, *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum* præfixa, §. 84. sqq. et p. 260 sqq. Illud autem prætermitti non debet, ab Anglis illis, quos hierarchicos et Episcopales vocant, ex omnibus

Ignatio tributis Epistolis septem probari, a Vossio et Usserio editas, nempe ad Smyrnæos, ad Polycarpum, ad Ephesios, ad Magnesios, ad Philadelphienses, ad Trallianos, et ad Romanos. Has illi libenter pro genuinis admittunt, propterea quod inde contra Genevensis disciplinæ cultores dilucide probari possit, discrimen inter Episcopos et Presbyteros jam Ignatii ævo observatum. Contra confictas omnino et subdititias eas esse, contenderunt alii doctrina et judicio præstantissimi viri, Salmasius, Blondellus, Albertinus, Dallæus, Larroquanus, Samuel Basnagius, nec Spanhemio juniori refragante; quibus ex nostris post Centuriatores Magdeburgicos et Martinum Chemnitium accessere Josua Arndius et Tenzelius. Nec facile lector ab omni partium studio alienus horum posteriorum sententiam damnare poterit, quippe quam Canon ille criticus firmat: *Quicumque liber non refert animum et affectum ejus, cujus præ se nomen fert, sed plane diversum, is non potest non esse suppositivius.* Uti enim hinc recte colligimus, Pauli ad Senecam epistolas esse ὑποβολιμαίους, cum haudquaquam spirent robur illud animi, sapientiam et affectum illum Christianum, quo Paulum constat fuisse præditum: ita nec vitio cuiquam verti posse videtur, qui præter alias Ignatio perperam tributas Epistolas, etiam septem illas, Anglis Episcopalibus nimis caras, repudiat, cum omnia in illis sint frigida, jejuna, inepti tumoris affectatæque grandiloquentiæ plena. Nec multum earum patronos tutoresque juvat Eusebii ac Hieronymi, easdem nominatim laudantium, autoritas: cum non ignotum sit, ab hoc etiam putidas illas nænias, quæ sub Pauli nomine ad Senecam extant, probatas esse, et plerosque Ecclesiæ Patrum non tam fuisse acutos, quin Sibyllinis carminibus aliisque hujus furfuris libellis imponi sibi paterentur. Præterea dubitari non potest, quin in Critica omni quæstione argumentum externum (quale est id ab Hieronymi et Eusebii citatione ductum) interno, quod paulo ante prolatus canon criticus continet, sit postponendum.—P. 196.

1722.

Oudin (Casim.) *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesiæ Antiquis. Francofurti.* 1722. 3 *Vol. fol.*

Nos ad ambiguitatem omnem et æquivocationem amoliendam, missis procul argumentis omnibus, quæ vel interpolationibus ac laciniis fulciuntur, vel ex sex posterioribus Epistolis, quas et Vossius et Usserius falsas bona fide fatentur, accipiuntur, has tantum rationes producemus, quibus impugnantur *Epistolæ illæ sex vel septem Ignatii Martyris*, ab Eusebio et D. Hieronymo recensitæ, juxta eam editionem, tam Latinam veterem quam anno 1642 in 8vo Oxoniæ ex MSS. Anglicanis in lucem publicam Jacobus Usserius protulit, quam Græcam vel Græco-Latinam ab Isaaco Vossio ex MS. Codice Bibliothecæ Florentinæ Mediceæ, anno 1646 in 4to. Amstelomdami impressam, quas solas germanas tum eruditi hodie Pontificii, tum Angli etiam reformati censent. Vide quæ diximus supra de Epistola S. Ignatii ad Romanos Græce jam edita, cap. 5. Dissertationis de scriptis Sancti Clementis Romani Episcopi.

Caput Quintum. Ostenditur variis rationibus, Epistolas Ignatii Antiocheni, qualiter etiam a Jacobo Usserio et Isaaco Vossio editæ sunt, esse spurias et adulterinas.

Dicimus itaque post Dallæum, *Epistolas septem* Ignatii nomine editas tam Græce quam Latine, esse Antiocheno huic Episcopo suppositas, paucis ex eodem verbotenus contractis argumentis.—P. 88.

1724.

Lampe (Frid. Adol.) *Commentarius Analytico—Exegeticus tam literalis quam realis Evangelii secundum Joannem. Amstelodami,* 1724. 3 *Vol.* 4*to.*

Epistolas Ignatii, quæ putantur, aut suppositiitias aut sane admodum corruptas esse, ita ut ex iis tuta traditionis Ecclesiasticæ subsidia peti non possint, post Salmasium et Blondellum data opera demonstrarunt Gul. Ernestus Tenzelius Exercitationibus selectis Exerc. iii. Joh. Dallæus in tractatu de scriptis, quæ sub Dionysii Areopagitæ, et Ignatii nominibus circumferuntur, toto libro secundo, ejusque contra Joannem Pearsonium defensor, Matthæus Larroquanus in observationibus ad Pearsonianas Ignatii Vindicias ἀνονύμως conscriptis.—Vol. i. p. 184.

1734.

Beausobre (Isaac de), *Histoire Critique de Manichée et du Manicheisme. Amsterdam,* 1734. 4to.

Je ne veux, ni défendre, ni combattre l'authenticité des *Lettres de St. Ignace.* Si elles ne sont pas veritables, elle ne laissent pas d'être fort anciennes; et l'opinion, qui me paroît la plus raisonnable est que les plus pures ont été interpolées.—Vol. i. p. 378. not. 3.

1743.

Lardner (Nathaniel), *Credibility of the Gospel History.* 12 Volumes, 1733—1755.

I have carefully compared the two editions, and am very well satisfied, upon that comparison, that the Larger are an interpolation of the Smaller, and not the Smaller an epitome or abridgment of the Larger. I desire no better evidence in a thing of this nature. And the Quotations of Ignatius do also better agree with the Smaller than the Larger epistles, as may be seen in Archbishop Usher's Dissertations. But whether the Smaller themselves are the genuine writings of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, is a question that has been much disputed, and has employed the pens of the ablest critics. And whatever

positiveness some may have shewn on either side, I must own I have found it a very difficult question. — Pt. 11. Chap. v. *Lardner's Works: edit. London*, 1788. Vol. ii. p. 63.

1745.

Weismann (Christ. Eber.) *Introductio in Memorabilia Ecclesiastica.* Halæ. Magd. 1745. 2 vol. 4to.

Epistolarum authentia et veritas tam aperte et solide ab Eruditis quibusdam viris, inter quos laudatissimam operam huic negotio impendit Jo. Pearson, in Vindiciis Ignatianis, demonstrata est, ut objectiones, ab initio contradictionis magis speciosæ, nunc inanes et leves haberi possint, et satis apertum est quod ad substantiam rei, nihil posse solidi opponi, quidquid sit de quibusdam locis et circumstantiis specialibus, quæ facilius est in litem provocare problematicam. . . . . Interim idem vir Doctissimus (Moshemius) nec breviores epistolas ex codice Mediceo editas ubique fluere puras existimat. Quibus dubiis durantibus, ne sic quidem usus harum epistolarum apud morosos et Criticos lectores erit magnus et stabilis.—P. 137.

1746.

Heumann (Christ. Aug.) *Conspectus Reipublicæ Literariæ: Hanoveræ*, 1763. *edit.* 7. 12*mo.*

Ad *Pseudo-Ignatium* quod attinet, est sane quod mirer, esse adhuc eruditissimos viros, qui sputa ejus lingant, nec agnoscant fraudem tot manifestis proditam indiciis. Vide, quæso, quæ dixi a 1710 *in Actis Eruditorum*, p. 196. *sqq.* Atque hæc transcribere dignatus est in suos *Commentarios de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis Oudinus*, qui et cætera argumenta profert, quæ credere nos cogunt, epistolas illas nulla excepta esse foetus subditicios. *Clericus* quidem in *Arte* sua *Critica* judicat, *Pearsonium eo successu defendisse* Epistolas Ignatii, *ut bellum illud certa ac perpetua victoria confecerit.* Verum tam acuti viri oculos, credo, præstrinxit auctoritas Episcoporum Angliæ, quorum animos dissensione sua[1] offendere non sustinebat. Contrarium edoceri potest, qui legere voluerit editas Rothomagi a 1674. *Matthæi Larroquani Observationes in Ignatianas Pearsonii Vindicias:* quas nuper Colerus recensuit in *Bibliotheca* sua *theologica.* Mihi quidem hæc potissima videntur ac certissima τῆς νοθείας indicia. 1. Scopus harum epistolarum, id spectantium, ut in immensum augeatur auctoritas ac majestas Episcoporum. Id quod indicio est, vel post Cyprianum scripsisse illarum auctorem epistolarum. Ac observarit *Dodwellus, non esse ovum ovo similius, quam Ignatianæ totam Cypriani de Episcoporum auctoritate ratiocinationem.* 2. Silentium de his epistolis per tria priora sæcula; cognomen

(1) Observatum quibusdam est, multa fecisse *Clericum* in gratiam Episcoporum Angliæ, metu scilicet adductum, ne aliquando inusta hæreseos noto Batavis cogeretur terris excedere, sperantemque, fore tum, ut sacri Angliæ proceres se reciperent in sua tabernacula.

Theophori in epistolarum harum inscriptionibus nomini Ignatii adjunctum; 4. fabulæ junioris ævi, *e.g.* in *Epistolæ ad Ephesios*, §. xix.; 5. ipsa peregrinationis ratio, in qua scriptæ dicuntur hæ epistolæ . . . . . 6. ipsa styli facies. Certe quotiescunque has legi epistolas, (legi autem sæpius,) deprehendi, omnia in illis esse frigida, jejuna, inepti tumoris affectatæque grandiloquentiæ plena, et nimis vivide spirantia vanum ac planum Græculum; 7. auctoritas summorum Criticorum. Eusebius quidem eas epistolas, et quidem primus, venditavit pro genuinis. Verum quis moveatur auctoritate hominis criticæ prudentiæ tam expertis, ut vel Abgari et Christi mutuas epistolas pro veris amplexetur? Quis non potius eos ducat sequendos, qui post susceptum illarum epistolarum examen censuerunt, eas ad unam omnes a Græculo quopiam declamatore confectas et confictas fuisse? Dixerunt antem hanc sententiam *Centuriatores Magdeburgici*, *Mart. Chemnitius*, *Jo. Gerhardus*, *Kortholtus*, *Tenzelius*, *Zeltnerus*, *Calvinus*, *Blondellus*, *Salmasius*, *Dallæus*, *Whitakerius*, *Rob. Cocus*, *Rob. Parkerus*, *Sam. Basnagius*, *Albertinus*, *Mat. et Dan. Larroquani*, *Frid. Spanhemius*, *Lampius*. Omnium vero primo loco poni oportet *Photium*, qui, dum in sua *Bibliotheca* Epistolas Ignatii non recognovit, tacitus clamat, sibi dubium haud esse, quin nomen eæ gerant falsissimum.—p. 492.

1751.

Jortin (John), *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*. London, 1751. 8vo.

They who contend for the *larger* Epistles would do well to weigh one thing, which they never seem to think of, namely, that, whilst they want to support I know not what, they are hurting the reputation of an Apostolical Father, whom they have in great esteem: for if the passages which I have already pointed out, and those which others have censured, could be shewed to be genuine, Ignatius would be much less valued than he is by men of sense and judgment. But though the shorter Epistles are on many accounts preferable to the larger, yet I will not affirm that they have undergone no alteration at all.—Vol. i. p. 361.

1755.

Mosheim (J. L.), *An Ecclesiastical History, Antient and Modern, translated by Archibald Maclaine*. London, 1765. 2 Vol. 4to.

There are yet extant several epistles attributed to him, concerning the authenticity of which there have been, however, warm disputes among the learned, which still subsist. Of these epistles, seven are said to have been written by this eminent martyr, during his journey from Antioch to Rome; and these the most of learned men acknowledge to be genuine, as they stand in the edition that was published in the last century, from a manuscript in the Medicean library. The others are generally rejected as spurious. As to my own sentiments of this matter, though I am willing to adopt this opinion as preferable to any other, yet I cannot help looking upon the authenticity of the

Epistle to Polycarp as extremely dubious, on account of the difference of style; and, indeed, the whole question relating to the epistles of St. Ignatius in general, seems to me to labour under much obscurity, and to be embarrassed with many difficulties.—Vol. i. p. 51.

1761.

Ernesti (J. Aug.), *Neue Theologische Bibliothek. Leipzig*, 1761. 8vo.

Wir erinnern uns dabey, dass dieses abgeschmackte Gleichniss unter die Dinge gehöret, um derentwillen wir lange aufgehöret haben zu glauben, dass Ignatius Verfasser von den unter seinem Namen bekannten Briefen sey, die Vossius und Usserius für echt erkannt haben, da wir mit der Meynung, sie zu lesen angefangen hatten, sie wären von ihm. Denn da kömmt gar oft das schöne Sprüchlein vor: Wer den Bischof ehret, der ehret Gott den Vater, wer den Priester, u. s. w. Wir können nicht glauben, dass ein *Vir Apostolicus*, den das Alterthum so rühmet, solche dumme Briefe habe schreiben können, und dass es der christl. Religion eine Ehre sey, das zu glauben und zu vertheidigen. Vol. 2. p. 489.

1768.

Griesbach (J. J.), *Dissertatio historico-theologica locos Theologicos ex Leone Magno, Pontifice Romano, sistens. Hallæ*, 1768. 4to.

Sic ortæ sunt procul dubio duæ illæ *Actuum Andreæ* recensiones, quarum alteram omnes repudiant, alteram vero *Bellarminus* et *Natalis Alexander* cum aliis quibusdam pontificiis defendunt. Vide *Beausobre*. I. c. p. 400. Utra genuina, utra adulterata sit, id ad hanc causam nullius est momenti, cum illud tantum affirmem, utramlibet esse a quadam Christianorum parte ad confirmandas suas opiniones immutatam. Forsitan etiam duplex illa *Ignatianarum Epistolarum* recensio invenustis hujusmodi studiis suam debet originem. Quid? si utraque, quæ nobis superest, recensio dicatur paraphrasis esse Epistolarum Ignatii genuinarum, plane deperditarum? Non desunt enim in utraque interpolationum ac immutationum vestigia. A diversis Christianorum sectis, quarum altera tamen multo audacior fuit altera, concinnatæ videntur diversæ editiones.—*J. J. Griesbachii Opuscula Academica*. 8vo. *Jenæ*, 1824. Vol. i. p. 26.

1775.

Schroeckh (J. M.), *Christliche Kirchengeschichte*. Leipzig, 1775. 8vo.

Aber mitten unter dem guten Begriffe, den man von diesen kürzern Briefen bekömmt, erheben sich auch manche Zweifel, welche sie verdächtig machen. Nicht zu gedenken, dass es Stellen darinne giebt, von welchen man nicht sehen kann, wozu sie den Gemeinen dienen sollten, indem sie ausser Verbindung mit dem übrigen Inhalte und Endzwecke stehen; so trifft man auch andere an, die entweder sonderbare und dunkle Einfälle über Lehren

der Religion enthalten, (wie ad Ephes. c. 19. von den drey Geheimnissen des Geschreyes, die in einem göttlichen Stillschweigen vollendet worden seyn sollen, der Jungfrauschaft und Schwangerschaft Mariä; und dem Tode Jesu;) oder solche, die auf Ketzereyen zu zielen scheinen, welche erst nach den Zeiten des Ignatius aufkamen, (wie ad Magnes. c. 8. von der Sige des Valentinus:) oder noch andere, in denen die Lehren des Christenthums nicht in den richtigsten Ausdrücken vorgestellt sind, (wie ad Smyrn. c. 1. wo Jesus Christus *der Sohn Gottes nach dem Willen und nach der Macht Gottes* genannt wird). Noch hat der Brief an den Polycarpus die merkliche Verschiedenheit der Schreibart, gegen die andern Briefe gehalten, wider sich: und vielen kommt es auch unnatürlich vor, dass in demselben eine weitläuftige Stelle an die Gemeine zu Smyrna gerichtet ist, an welche Ignatius besonders geschrieben hatte. Alle diese Vorwürfe können vielleicht abgelehnt oder gemildert werden; der wichtigste ist noch übrig, nämlich der ausserordentliche Eifer für die bischöfliche Würde und Regierung, der in diesen Briefen herrscht, und in der Empfehlung eines vollkommnen Gehorsams, einer uneingeschränkten Unterwürfigkeit gegen die Bischöfe geschäftig ist. Eine so hervorstechende Absicht, muss man dabey denken, kommt nicht einem so bescheidenen Schüler der Apostel, nicht Zeiten zu, in denen die kaum entstandnen Bischöfe nur lehrten, niemanden aber zu befehlen suchten. Man hat zwar dabey die Anmerkung gemacht, es sey zu einer Zeit, da die Religion der Christen schon von so manchen Irrlehrern verdreht wurde, durchaus nothwendig gewesen, dass sie ihren Lehren, die zum Theil von den Aposteln selbst waren gesetzt worden, die Christliche Religion sehr wohl kannten, und sie auch in ihrem Leben ausübten, ohne alle Ausnahme gehorchten: zumal, setzt man hinzu, da die Schriften der Apostel damals noch nicht allen Christen bekannt waren, und auch das Wohl, die Festigkeit dieser ersten Gemeinen, auf der genausten Verbindung mit ihren Lehrern beruhten. Aber diese nicht ungegründete oder doch scheinbare Entschuldigung ist kaum für diese Briefe zulänglich. Denn es ist nicht bloss Folgsamkeit gegen die christlichen Vorschriften der Lehrer, die den Christen darinne auferlegt wird; sie werden vielmehr belehrt, dass sie *auf den Bischof so sehr, als auf den Herrn selbst sehen* müssten; (ad Ephes. c. 6.) sie wären verbunden, *dem Bischof eben so nachzufolgen, wie Jesus Christus seinem Vater, und den Aeltesten so wie den Aposteln*, (ad Smyr. c. 8.) und *wer etwas ohne Vorwissen des Bischofs verrichte, diene dem Teufel* (ibid. c. 9.). Schwerlich ist dieses die Sprache der Apostel, und der Geist des Christenthums, das seine Verehrer keineswegs so knechtisch an Menschen verwiesen und gleichsam gebunden hat, sondern, bey allen Forderungen an dieselben, doch ihre Freyheit vor menschlichem Ansehen in Sicherheit setzt. Ein sehr gewöhnliches Mittel, durch welches man dieser und den übrigen Schwierigkeiten ausweichen kann, ist bey diesen Briefen mit gutem Erfolge gebraucht worden. Alle solche Stellen, hat man gesagt, die man mit der Denkungsart des *Ignatius* nicht vereinigen kann, sind Verfälschungen späterer Zeiten. So wahrscheinlich auch dieses ist, so schwer bleibt es gleichwohl, zu zeigen, welches die verfälschten Stellen sind.—Vol. ii. p. 341.

1784.

SEMLER (D. J. Sal.) *Paraphrasis in Epistolam* II. *Petri.* Halæ, 1784. 12mo.

Atque vel mediocriter perlegenti utramque Epistolarum recensionem satis patebit, interpolatorem jam in manibus habuisse quatuor Evangelia, omnes fere Epistolas Pauli, et primam Petri, forte et Jacobi; sed prima recensio, quæ est multo brevior, caruit tot allegationibus Veteris et Novi Testamenti; quia scilicet isto tempore tam copiosus canon nondum in ecclesia illa catholica receptus fuerat, cum ipsa societas hæc major nondum coiisset. Hic non opus est, ut repetamus longam illam controversiam de his Epistolis; mihi sufficit, jam Irenæum scivisse Epistolas Ignatii; excitavit enim aliquam sententiam (sum frumentum Christi etc.) quæ extat in epistola ad Romanos. Nempe Romæ aut in partibus Asiæ Minoris collectæ atque compositæ sunt hæ epistolæ; quas Irenæus jam novit; proprior scilicet officinæ, e qua prodierunt. Sub finem tamen sæculi 2. aut sub initium sæculi 3; nec potuit Irenæus aliquid ipse reperire, quod Valentinianæ opinioni opponeret; quales tamen sententiæ plures in istis Epistolis postea insunt. Clemens autem ille Alexandrinus, qui tamen itinera multa confecerat, nondum aliquid de Ignatio et omni ejus fabula didicerat. *Præfat.*

1795.

ROSENMÜLLER (D. J. G.), *Historia Interpretationis Librorum Sacrorum in Ecclesia Christiana.* Hildburg. 1795. 5 Vol. 12mo.

Ad *epistolas Ignatianas* quod attinet, totam earum caussam valde impeditam esse, omnes hodie fatentur. Quicquid sit de earum auctore, atque de tempore, quo scriptæ sunt, hoc saltem certum est et indubitatum, tantam esse Ignatiarum Epistolarum et Pseudo-Clementinarum Constitutionum, quæ Apostolicæ nominantur, cognationem et similitudinem, ut dubitari vix possit, quin alteruter Scriptor alterius dogmata atque præcepta expresserit, quin etiam ejus sæpe sententias totidem verbis exscriptas transtulerit. Viderunt hoc etiam alii e. c. Franciscus Turrianus et Carolus Bovius, quorum uterque confidenter pronuntiat, Ignatium Constitutiones Apostolorum esse imitatum. Alii fortassis dicent, Auctorem Constitutionum imitatum esse epistolas Ignatianas, et uberiore sermone, additis Scripturæ locis amplificasse ea, quæ in illis epistolis breviter dicta erant. Quis autem in re tam obscura pronunciaverit?—Vol. i. p. 116.

1798.

ZIEGLER (W. C. L.), *Versuch einer pragmatischen Geschichte der kirchlichen Verfassungsformen in den ersten sechs Jahrhunderten.* Leipzig, 1798. 8vo.

Den auffallendsten Beweis hievon würden die Briefe des Bischofs Ignatius (†106) von Antiochien geben, selbst diejenigen, welche Hammond und Pearson noch haben retten wollen, denn in den Briefen an die Smyrnenser, Magnesier und Trallenser steht der volle Stufenunterschied zwischen Bischöfen, Presby-

tern und Diaconen schon da: allein er ist auch bereits so stark gezeichnet, dass gerade diese Stellen es höchst wahrscheinlich machen, ihr Verfasser habe erst im dritten oder vierten Jahrhundert gelebt[1]. Eine sobere Kritik könnte zwar noch spätere Interpolationen annehmen, um wenigsten, den Grundstoff für den Ignatius zu retten, aber es scheint in der That wenig damit geholfen zu seyn, denn ich bin mit andern Gelehrten der Meinung, dass kaum noch ein Ganzes übrig bleiben dürfte, so bald man alle verdächtige Stellen heraus wirft[2]. Wer vermag es, den Urstoff zu sondern von den spätern Interpolationen oder Ueberarbeitungen, die zu verschiedenen Zeiten erfolgt sind, um einem sichern historischen Beweis für eine gewisse Zeit aus diesem Cento führen zu können?—P. 16.

(1) Schon der grosse Just Henning Böhmer hielt unter den Deutchen die ganzen Briefe des Ignatius dieser Stellen wegen für untergeschoben, Diss. vi. de differentia inter ordinem ecclesiasticum, p. 333. Nachher haben sich Ernesti, Semler und Andere ebenfalls dagegen erklärt. Unter den Ausländern war wohl Saumaise der erste, welcher sie apodictisch dem Ignatius absprach. Er schrieb schon im Jahr 1645. *Ignatium non esse earum auctorem, tam certum puto, quam me hæc scribere.* cf. Salmasius, l. c. p. 58 fine.

(2) S. Rösler's Bibliothek der Kirchenväter 1. Th. S. 70. und Schmidt's Versuch über die gedoppelte Recension der Briefe des Ignatius in Henke's Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, u. s. w. 3. B. 1. St. Aus der scharfsinnigen kritischen Untersuchung dieses Gelehrten ergiebt sich, dass es durch die Ueberarbeitung dieser Briefe, welche schon zur Zeit des Irenäus dem Ignatius beygelegt wurden, von Seiten der Katholischen Kirche unmöglich geworden ist den Urstoff noch heraus zu finden, wie er etwa zur Zeit des Irenäus war. Die zeitige Dogmatik der katholischen Partey und die zeitige Hierarchie sind so eng mit dem Ganzen verwebt, dass keine Absonderung mehr möglich ist. Der Urstoff mag immerhin schon aus den Zeiten des Antonin's oder Marc Aurel's seyn, wohin Saumaise das Ganze verlegen wollte. Es heisst nähmlich in dem Briefe an die Magnesier "der ewige Logos, welcher nicht aus der Sige hervor geht" (λογος αϊδιος ουκ απο Σιγης προελθων). Diess bezieht sich auf die Valentinianer, welche viel von einem Βυθος und einer Σιγη sprachen. Hieraus schliesst Saumaise, dass damahls, als diess geschrieben wurde, die Valentinianer recht blühen mussten, und nimmt desswegen jenes Zeitalter an. Weil aber auch zugleich in diesem Briefe der hierarchische Stufenunterschied eine νεοτερικη ταξις heisst, so meint er ebenfalls, dass er um diese Zeit aufgekommen seyn müsse. Allein so stark, wie er hier gezeichnet wird, so dass der Bischof Gott und die Presbyter die Apostel vorstellen sollen, war dieser Unterschied in der Mitte des zweyten Jahrhunderts noch nicht. Dergleichen kann nur aus dem dritten oder vierten Jahrhunderte seyn.

1816.

Kestner (Chr. Aug.), *Commentatio de Eusebii, Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Conditoris, Auctoritate et fide diplomatica.* Gottingæ, 1816. 4to.

Quales igitur quantasque etiam ab hac parte critico Eusebii studio ætate nostra gratias agere debebimus? Sed cautio tamen in hac re adhibenda erit, ne Eusebianæ sententiæ gravitati falsa quadam ratiocinatione aliquando noceamus. Fieri enim potest, ut Eusebius authentiam librorum quorundam strenue defendat, quos nostra quidem ætate pro spuriis haberi et habendos esse sciamus. Exemplo hujus rei sint *Ignazii* epistolæ; quas quidem Eusebius pro genuinis habendas esse notat atque etiam iii. 38. (ab init cap.) his verbis: "(ωσπερουν αμελει του Ιγνατιου, (sc. παραδοσις φερεται) εν αις κατελεξαμεν επιστολαις" idem contendere perseverat. Recentiores vero, velut Blondellus, Salmasius,

Owenus novissimeque Semlerus illas supposititias esse eo maxime argumento probarunt, quod multæ illæ continerent, quæ *Ignazii* tempore scribi omnino non potuissent; qualia essent, quæ in epistola ad Trallenses luculentissime ad Papam extollendum spectantia reperirentur. Sed quam facile in hac re ab omni culpa liberari poterit Eusebius, si res, quæ cum Ignazii tempore non congruunt, post Eusebii ætatem demum a falsario quodam interpolatas esse eadem conjectura evincas, qua jam Strothius, et præcipue Hammond et Pearson illas Epistolas non *totas* saltem spurias esse probaverunt.—p. 63.

1818.

Henke (H. P. K.), *Allgemeine Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche. Braunschweig*, 1818. 8vo.

Von einem Bischofe zu Antiochien, wenn Petrus mit gezählt wird, dem dritten, Ignatius, welchen Trajan selbst gekannt, und zum Kampfe mit wilden Thieren verurtheilt haben soll, sind einige Briefe, die auf seiner Reise nach Rom zu solchen Kampfe von ihm geschrieben seyn sollen. Aber man ist über Anzahl und Aechtheit derselben, über den kürzern oder längern Text, und den Werth des Inhalts, nicht einig. Sie sind voll hoher Begriffe von Bischofswürde und voll Ruhms derer, die für ihren Eifer verfolgt und getödtet werden, (Märtyrer) über wichtigere Dinge sehr seicht und armselig, und passen durchaus nicht für die Verhältnisse jener Zeit und für den Mann.—Vol. i. p. 96.

1824.

Schmidt (Joh. Ernst Christ.), *Handbuch der Christlichen Kirchengeschichte.* Giessen, 1824. 8vo.

Die ersten Spuren solcher Bestrebungen zeigen sich in der Geschichte des Ignatius, Bischofs von Antiochien—wenn anders den, unter seinem Namen vorhandenen Briefen, zu trauen ist. In Rücksicht dieser Briefe zeigt sich die sonderbare Erscheinung, dass sie in zwiefacher Gestalt vorhanden sind, einmahl kürzer, das andere mahl länger und weitläuftiger. Die kürzeren Briefe enthalten manches, was sich nicht in den längeren findet. Dass auch die längeren vieles enthalten, was man in den kürzeren vermisst, versteht sich ohnehin. Das Eigenthümliche, sowohl der längern als der der kürzern Briefe, bestehet theils in Zusätzen von Bibelstellen, theils in Beziehungen auf Ketzereyen der späteren Zeit. Dass dies alles von einer späteren Hand abgeleitet werden müsse, daran kann man nicht zweifeln; und die Sache enthält auch nichts befremdendes, denn man hat Beyspiele, dass ältere christliche Schriften von den späteren Christen auf diese Weise behandelt,—und, wie man glaubte, verbessert wurden. Nimmt man aber dieses alles weg, so stimmen doch beyde Texte noch nicht ganz mit einander überein. Allein beynahe alle Abweichungen, welche jetzt noch übrig bleiben, betreffen entweder dogmatische Stellen,

oder Stellen von lokalem und individuellem Bezug. Setzt man bey erstern voraus, dass man sich's in spätern Zeiten erlaubt habe, dasjenige, was nach den Bestimmungen dieser spätern Zeiten nicht ganz rechtgläubig ausgedrückt war, zu verändern,—und nimmt man bey letzteren an, dass man dasjenige, was lokalen und individuellen Bezug hatte, darum späterhin verändert habe, um dadurch die Briefe allgemeiner brauchbar zu machen: so ist dies wenigstens ein Verfahren, was nicht den Vorwurf eines willkührlichen verdient.—Dass Ignatius solche Briefe geschrieben habe, dass diese sehr frühe ziemlich weit verbreitet wurden, dass dieselben manche Stellen enthielten, welche sich in den noch vorhandenen wieder finden: dies alles ist historisch erweislich. Es muss daher erlaubt seyn, dass man auf die angegebene Weise versuche, aus den vorhandenen Briefen die ursprüngliche Grundlage derselben herzustellen. Freylich bleiben dann noch Stellen übrig, von welchen man sagt, sie verriethen die Denkart späterer Zeiten—nämlich Stellen, die zur Erhebuug des Ansehens der Bischöfe beytragen. Allein, war jene hohe Achtung für die Bischöfliche Würde diesen Zeiten wirklich so fremde, als man nun einmahl annimmt? Hiervon wird künftig noch die Rede seyn. Und wäre dies auch: wer bürgt denn dafür, dass nicht gerade die Ignazischen Briefe vieles dazu beytrugen, um die Denkart der folgenden Zeit zu bestimmen?—Vol. i. p. 200.

1826.

Neander (Augustus), *The History of the Christian Religion and Church during the Three First Centuries.* Translated by H. J. Rose. 1841.

Ignatius, Bishop of the Church at Antioch, in the time of the Emperor Trajan, it would appear, was carried as prisoner to Rome, where he expected to be exposed to wild beasts. On the journey, it would seem, he wrote seven Epistles; six to the Churches of Asia Minor, and one to Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna. Certainly these epistles contain passages which at least bear completely upon them the character of Antiquity. This is particularly the case with the passages directed against Judaism and Docetism: but even the shorter and more trustworthy edition is very much interpolated.—Vol. ii. p. 334.

To the second edition of his Church-History, published in the year 1843, Neander has added the following to the above passage:—

Wie der Bericht über den Martyrertod des Ignatius sehr verdächtig ist, so tragen auch die Briefe, welche die Richtigkeit dieser verdächtigen Sage voraussetzen, durchaus nicht das Gepräge einer bestimmten Eigenthümlichkeit und eines Mannes aus dieser Zeit, eines Mannes, der seine letzten Worte den Gemeinden zuruft. Eine hierarchische Absichtlichkeit ist nicht zu verkennen. p. 1140.

1832.

Baumgarten—Crusius (Lud. Tr. Ott.), *Lehrbuch der Christlichen Dogmengeschichte.* Jena, 1832. 8vo.

—— Vornehmlich in den sieben Briefen des Ignatius ist es durchaus nicht mehr erkennbar, wie viel sich von dem Vorhandenen in den Originalen gefunden habe[1].—P. 83.

(1) Die Citate bei den älteren Vätern ausgenommen. Ausser den sieben Briefen (Eus. H. E 3. 36. Hieron catal. 16.) ist alles Ignatianische entschieden unächt, und, seitdem die beiden Recensionen von jenen neben einander bekannt sind, wird die kürzere gewöhnlich vorgezogen, und für ächt gehalten; höchstens den an die Römer ausgenommen. Die Gründe dagegen von J. Dalläus (de scriptis, quæ sub Di. Ar. et Ignatii nominibus circumferuntur. Gen. 666. 4. vgl. J. Pearson: Vindiciæ epp. S. Ign. Cantbr. 672. 4.) sind indess nicht widerlegt. Nach Semler, Griesbach (opusc. L. 26.), Schmidt (ü. die gedoppelte Recension der Briefe des Ign. Henk. Mag. iii. 91.) Stäudlin (G. d. SL. I. ii. 84.) u. A., hat man wahrscheinlich beide Recensionen für Ueberarbeitungen der Originale anzusehen: die kürzere mehr im kirchlichen, die längere mehr im dogmatischen Interesse angelegt; daher sich in dieser auch noch bestimmtere Hindeutungen auf Häretiker finden, und entschiedener Gebrauch apost. Stellen. Es ist nicht unmöglich, dass sich noch andere Recensionen der Schriften einmal vorfinden.—*Ausg. von Tho. Smith, Oxon.* 709. 4.

1834.

Harless (G. C. A.), *Commentur über den Brief Pauli an die Ephesier.* 1834.

Der Streit, ob die ältere oder kürzere der Recensionen den ächten Text gebe, oder welche von beiden reiner und weniger entstellt, ist noch nicht zur Entscheidung gekommen. Jedenfalls glaube ich jedoch die Meinung Heumann's und Oudin's als seien diese Briefe durchaus unächt, mit den bedeutendsten Kritiken älterer und neuerer Zeit entschieden verwerfen zu müssen. *Einleitung*, p. xxxiv.

1840.

Baumgarten—Crusius (Lud. Tr. Ott.), *Compendium der Christlichen Dogmengeschichte. Leipzig*, 1840. 8vo.

Die Untersuchungen über die sieben Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia, obwohl noch nicht geschlossen, haben doch wieder der ältern Meinung näher geführt, dass die kürzere, später aufgefundene Recension ursprünglicher sei, als die längere, und dass sich in dieser mannichfache Entstellungen des ursprünglichen Sinnes finden. Indessen kann auch die kürzere noch, wo nicht Ueberarbeitungen, doch Interpolationen, erfahren haben. Die zwei, in den Briefen hervortretenden Idee'n, die Verehrung des bischöflichen Amts, und die Bestreitung des Doketismus, lassen sich in der Einfachheit, wie sie sich hier darlegen, durchaus mit Sinn und Art der ältesten Zeiten der Kirche vereinbaren.—P. 79.

WORKS BY THE REV. W. CURETON.

I.

كتاب الملل والنحل: BOOK OF RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL SECTS, by MUHAMMAD AL-SHAHRASTÁNI: now first edited from the collation of several MSS. 8vo. London. For the Society for the Publication of Oriental Texts. 2 Voll. 1842, 1846.

II.

שרח ספר קינות: TANCHUMI HIEROSOLYMITANI Commentarius Arabicus in LAMENTATIONES: e codice unico Bodleiano literis Hebraicis exarato. 8vo. Londini, apud Jac. Madden, 1843.

III.

عمدة عقيدة اهل السنة والجماعة: PILLAR OF THE CREED OF THE SUNNITES; being a brief Exposition of their principal Tenets, by AL-NASAFI. 8vo. London. For the Society for the Publication of Oriental Texts. 1843.

IV.

THE ANTIENT SYRIAC VERSION OF THE EPISTLES OF ST. IGNATIUS to St. Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans. Edited with an English Translation and Notes. 8vo. London, Rivingtons. Berlin, Asher and Co. 1845.

The whole of the impression of this work being already exhausted, a new and enlarged edition is in the course of preparation.

V.

CATALOGUS CODICUM MANUSCRIPTORUM ARABICORUM, qui in MUSEO BRITANNICO asservantur. Pars I. fol. Londini, Impensis Curatorum Musei Britannici. 1846.

IN THE PRESS.

ܐܓܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ: THE SYRIAC VERSION OF THE FESTAL LETTERS OF ATHANASIUS, with an English Translation and Notes.

THE ORIGINAL GREEK COPY OF THESE LETTERS IS LOST.

ܡܥܠܠܐ ܕܩܠܡܣ: THE SYRIAC VERSION OF THE RECOGNITIONS OF ST. CLEMENT, with an English Translation and Notes.

THE ORIGINAL GREEK OF THIS WORK HAS LIKEWISE BEEN LOST.

SPICILEGIUM SYRIACUM; or Remnants of Writers of the Second and Third Centuries, preserved in the Syriac, with an English Translation and Notes. Part I. will contain the Remnants of Bardesanes, Melito, Irenæus, and Hippolytus.

DATE DUE

JUN 15 1982

JUN 15 1983

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BW243 .Z7C9
Vindiciae Ignatianae : or, The genuine
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00058 8451